NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Royal Oak, Michigan | April 25, 1938 | Subscription: Three Dollars Per Year | 10¢

SOCIAL SECURITY
BY
James F. Edwards

•

A CHALLENGE TO MESSRS. SLOAN AND CHRYSLER
Robert H. Hemphill

•

THE DISEASE OF MONOPOLY
Hilaire Belloc

•

AMERICA INVADED
Fred L. Crawford

•

WE WANT LEADERSHIP
Dr. Edward Lodge Curran

•

A NEW BOOK and A NEW MAN
Leon Hamilton

VOLUME IA No. 9

Rep. John J. O'Connor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Social Justice

APRIL 25, 1938

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Twilight of the Demigods
AN EDITORIAL — PAGE 3

Social Security—Will It Secure?
JAMES F. EDWARDS — PAGE 5

The Early Guild Town
JOSEPH BONDY — PAGE 7

The Disease of Monopoly
HILAIRE BELLOC — PAGE 8

America Invaded
HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD — PAGE 9

The Tragedy of Spain
LUIS PEREZ DE OLAGUER-FELIU — PAGE 11

We Want Leadership
DR. EDWARD LODGE CURRAN — PAGE 12

A New Book and a New Man
LEON HAMILTON — PAGE 14

A Challenge to Messrs. Sloan and Chrysler
ROBERT H. HEMPHILL — PAGE 17

BIOGRAPHY

Damien The Leper
(Conclusion)
JOHN FARROW — PAGE 13

FEATURES

Father Coughlin Replies — PAGE 2

"Will the Gentleman Yield?" — PAGE 10

Curbstone Editorials — PAGE 15

FROM THE TOWER

More About the Corporate State
FATHER COUGHLIN — PAGE 4

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK

Pilgrims to the Shrine
REV. CYRIL KEATING — PAGE 19

EDITORIALS

It Can Only Happen Here
History "Made in Japan"
Together, Yet Miles Apart
Kerensky Surveys Russia
PAGE 6

CONTEST

It Pays to Know "America Today" — PAGE 16

COVER

Rep. John J. O'Connor

SOCIAL JUSTICE, National Weekly, Copyrighted 1938, by The Social Justice Publishing Corporation; publication and editorial office, 1416 Woodward Ave., Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks is required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Rev. Charles E. Coughlin, LL.D., Editorial Counsel (by permission of his Ecclesiastical Superior); Stanley G. Boynton, General Manager, E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted, either wholly or in part without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from Social Justice for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Picture Credits: Acme—Cover, Pages 11, 14; Keystone—Page 5 (left); Black Star—Page 5 (right); Underwood and Underwood—Page 9; International News—Page 12.

Volume 1A — Number 9

Father Coughlin Replies . . .

Asked to give a clear resume of the T.V.A., Father Coughlin quoted the following from the SPHERE magazine.

Senator Henry Styles Bridges of New Hampshire gave five reasons why the T.V.A. should be thoroughly investigated. They are as follows:

"1. The lawless refusal of TVA to obey the law for a period of more than 14 months in failing to report its allocation of costs to power and other functions.

"2. The disposal of 80 per cent of its power to private industrial corporations at give-away prices, an action in defiance of the letter and spirit of the law.

"3. The extensive purchase of phosphate lands at scandalously high rates permitting certain corporations a profit in excess of 100 per cent.

"4. The practice of TVA of forcing its rural customers to mortgage their income for years to come to buy electrical appliances far beyond their means and not needed in their simple rural economy.

"5. The wasteful and illegal expenditure of Federal funds involving exceptions by the Acting Comptroller General in excess of $15,000,000 in two years—1936 and 1937—with $10,700,000 involving almost 5,000 exceptions still outstanding."

The SPHERE magazine printed the following resume of the entire Tennessee Valley Authority flare-up:

"Probably President Roosevelt's most magnificent and appealing vision has been the regional development of the United States through the harnessing of the vast water-power resources along the basins of the great rivers. The first of the New Deal ventures in the field was the creation of the TVA to develop the facilities of the Tennessee Valley.

"In four years almost $200,000,000 have been spent and another appropriation of $40,000,000 will be made by this Congress. Continuing litigation and open warfare between the TVA and the utilities is a matter of public record throughout the whole period.

"There have been frequent indications of dissension, also, among the three TVA directors, but not until March, 1938, did it become publicly apparent to everybody that Mr. Roosevelt's most magnificent objective had almost completely bogged down in an administrative mud-puddle.

"The situation had become so bad, so embarrassing to the President and so dangerous to his prestige, as to prompt him to bring about one of the most dramatic incidents in peace-time American history. He called the TVA directors to the White House for a full discussion of the problem and took the extraordinarily bold course of making public the complete transcript of everything that was said.

"Chairman Arthur E. Morgan was president of Antioch college in Ohio, is an eminent engineer, and has always been looked upon as a pronounced liberal. Dr. Harcourt A. Morgan was president of the University of Tennessee; a sociologist and agronomist. Mr. David E. Lilienthal was a lawyer and a public utility baiter of proven skill and experience.

"In a series of letters and articles over a period of a year, Arthur Morgan had indicated that he was out of sympathy with many of the general policies of the TVA and, particularly, with the attitude of the other two directors towards the property rights of private utilities already operating in the territory.

"More recently, however, Arthur Morgan has become even more outspoken in his public utterances and has clearly reflected on the honesty and decency of purpose of his two colleagues.

"It was this latter which prompted the President, according to his own statement, to call the three directors to account at the historic White House meeting, March 11. Mr. Roosevelt's request that Dr. Arthur Morgan make public the facts to substantiate his charges produced the really dramatic feature of the meeting. Dr. Arthur Morgan refused, point-blank.

"A subordinate official of the Government, and an appointee of the President, publicly defied him!

"Why?

"Here is Chairman Morgan's reason, verbatim, from the transcript:

"'CHAIRMAN MORGAN: During a long period, I have repeatedly but unsuccessfully endeavored to secure the President's adequate consideration of grave conditions within the TVA. The most recent occasion was last fall at the meeting mentioned by the President concerning the *Atlantic Monthly* article when I personally presented to the President a draft of the letter and which I asked him to send to the TVA board. This letter requested the board to make available to me the data and assistance necessary for me to make a report to the President concerning the conditions I had criticized. The President did not grant that request and made no alternative suggestions. I am of the opinion that this meeting is not, and in the nature of the case cannot be, an effective or useful fact-finding occasion. . . .

"'Since the Congress has now taken up the matter, I believe that any report by me should, in the terms of the TVA Act, be filed with the President and with the Congress. It is my studied judgment that the President, the Congress and the people of this country are entitled to accurate information and appraisal of the program, policies, administration and activities of the authority. Such information and appraisal can best be obtained and made available to the people, to Congress and to the President by a Congressional Committee, which will make an impartial, comprehensive and complete investigation of the authority's affairs.'

"And that is just about all that Mr. Roosevelt could get out of Dr. Arthur Morgan after almost seven hours of discussion and cross examination.

"All circumstances considered, it is difficult to see how there can be any procedure, satisfactory to the public, other than a broad investigation of the TVA organization and activities by a Congressional Committee. . . .

"Clearly, Dr. Arthur Morgan looked upon the White House meeting as a conspiracy to discredit him and to prevent embarrassment to Mr. Roosevelt and the other board members which a continuation of the public fight would entail. . . .

"It is perfectly clear that Dr. Arthur Morgan early split with his colleagues on fundamental questions of policy having but little to do with the Berry claim or any other single incident.

"Dr. Arthur Morgan has plainly indicated his belief that the majority of the board, through a conspiracy between the TVA and the various municipalities in the Tennessee Valley area, intends to have a governmentally dominated power system by a process amounting to virtual confiscation of the private utility properties.

"Whether he is right or not, that, at least, is the bald issue which he proposes to present to Congress and the American people. . . .

"Likely, following a broad investigation, Congress will itself have to decide, in much clearer legislative language, just what the Government policy is to be, and also direct that the TVA board carry it out.

"It is obvious, however, that such agencies as the TVA must be administered under wide grants of authority, else even the most expert managers would fail."

Coming . . .

"English Prosperity vs. the Roosevelt Depression" is the self-explanatory title of the next article in the important series which Robert H. Hemphill, international financial authority, is writing for SOCIAL JUSTICE.

The "repudiation racket" whereby the international money manipulators set up totalitarian states and then repudiate the debt issues of the former governments is disclosed in an early article by Leon Hamilton.

The comic opera of farm relief, which would be a farce if it were not such a tragedy, is to be the subject of a forthcoming satire by Joseph P. Wright of the staff of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWILIGHT OF THE DEMIGODS

An Editorial

THE recent defeat in Congress of President Roosevelt's Reorganization bill marks a new birth of freedom in America.

The tide of dictatorship, engulfing one after another of the nations older and wiser than ours, has been definitely turned back from the shores of this land of the free.

Although these words are written in the midst of tense action, the brief interval that must elapse before they can appear in print will already have given to these events the perspective of history. The children of another generation, even more than our own, perhaps, will appreciate and praise a courageous Congress which acted to preserve Democracy.

Awakened to the peril of dictatorship in the powers conferred upon the President by his proposed reorganization bill, an aroused electorate exercised its right of petition. A new generation of Paul Reveres rode out to warn of this new peril to liberty in America; and a flood of letters and telegrams gave notice to official Washington that the people were on guard.

Thus encouraged by the support of their constituencies, members of Congress were emboldened to defy Administration pressure and spurn the lure of promised patronage. They voted to stop the dictatorship bill, by recommitting it to the graveyard of committee files.

It was notice to those who would change the form of our government by indirection that America is on guard.

AS IT was, however, victory was achieved by the bare margin of eight votes! The change of a mere four Congressmen would have meant the difference between the free America which endures today and the dictatorship which would already have been a fact by the time these lines could appear in print.

Whose telegram, what letter, what personal solicitation by a modern Paul Revere was the deciding factor in the switch of those four fateful votes? Who can know? In this crisis, *everyone was the unknown soldier:* every telegram, every letter, and every personal notification of another American on guard may have been—yea, WAS—the deciding factor. This was the people's victory—YOUR victory. And only your eternal vigilance will be the price of maintaining that victory.

But while we rejoice in victory, that margin of decision should be a sobering thought. Virtually one-half of the American Congress, despite the appeals of an aroused people, voted to change our Constitutional democracy for a one man rule. Either one-half the Congress, knowing the result, preferred dictatorship; or—in spite of the calm presentation of facts week after week by Father Coughlin on the radio, by SOCIAL JUSTICE in these columns, and by a commendably large section of the American press—still do not believe that the President intended to use the powers his bill would have given him.

Obviously, it was not alone in the letter but in the whole spirit of the bill that peril lay in wait for America. Attempts to delete the dangerous portions of the innocently worded measure—and there were several such honest efforts in Congress—only served to convince the reformers with what malign intent the whole measure had been framed.

Like its twin in iniquity, the Supreme Court packing proposal, the reorganization bill was of the essence of dictatorship, with planning and power in the hands of an executive given control of both the purse and the sword. Whether that power were used wisely or not, it would be too late for voters to do anything about when they discovered that the innocent little lamb was a wolf in sheep's clothing. The dictatorship would have been here.

The events of today become tomorrow's history; the fateful plannings for tomorrow, too soon, become today's reality.

Like Court Control, the Reorganization bill was recommitted to committee and, in effect, killed for this session of Congress. There is no finality in this disposition. Both will be revived. Only an alert citizenship awake to this constant peril can save America from the fate of the older nations of Europe.

Too often, our fears are assuaged by the false assurance that if we do not adopt either European Communism or European Fascism we will be safe, whereas there is building at this moment a totalitarian, socialistic bureaucracy more enslaving to American citizens than many a so-called Fascist dictatorship.

SOCIAL JUSTICE on this page prints the honor roll of the heroes of our modern Thermopylae. In an adjoining column are the names of those Congressmen who do not see the peril of dictatorship, or seeing it, prefer to have it that way.

Now that you have encouraged your representatives to defy the lightnings, stand by them. Let them know that you are standing by. Now that two such serious attempts upon our nation have been defeated, let us press on to positive enactments for an era of social justice in America. An honest money bill awaits enactment. Congressmen would pass it if they knew the voters would back them up.

THEIR VOTES SAVED AMERICA

Democrats: 108

Allen (Pa.)	Fleger	Palmisano
Ashbrook	Fletcher	Parsons
Barry	Ford (Miss.)	Patton
Beiter	Gambrill	Peterson (Ga.)
Bell	Garrett	Pettengill
Bigelow	Gavagan	Pfeifer
Bland	Gray (Ind.)	Phillips
Bloom	Gray (Pa.)	Polk
Boehne	Green	Rabaut
Boren	Hamilton	Ramspeck
Boylan	Harrington	Richards
Buck	Harter	Robertson
Burch	Hendricks	Rogers (Okla.)
Cannon (Wis.)	Hunter	Ryan
Chapman	Imhoff	Sanders
Clark (Idaho)	Jarman	Satterfield
Clark (N. C.)	Kennedy (Md.)	Scrugham
Claypool	Kleberg	Secrest
Coffee (Neb.)	Lamneck	Smith (Okla.)
Cole (Md.)	Lanham	Smith (Va.)
Collins	Lea	Smith (Conn.)
Costello	Lewis (Colo.)	Smith (W. Va.)
Cox	Luckey	South
Cravens	Ludlow	Spence
Crosser	McClellan	Stack
Cummings	McGroarty	Sullivan
Disney	McLaughlin	Sweeney
Dixon	McMillan	Tarver
Doxey	Mahon (Tex.)	Taylor (S. C.)
Driver	Mansfield	Thompson
Eckert	May	Towey
Edminston	Meeks	Umstead
Elliott	Moser	West
Evans	O'Connor (N. Y.)	Wilcox
Faddis	O'Leary	Woodrum
Ferguson	O'Malley	
	O'Neal	

Republicans: 88

Allen (Ill.)	Gilchrist	Reed (Ill.)
Andresen	Guyer	Reed (N. D.)
Andrews	Gwynne	Rees
Arends	Halleck	Rich
Bacon	Hancock (N. Y.)	Robsion
Barton	Hartley	Rockefeller
Bates	Hoffman	Rogers (Mass.)
Brewster	Holmes	Rutherford
Burdick	Hope	Seger
Carlson	Jarrett	Shafer
Carter	Jenkins	Short
Case	Jenks (N. Hamp.)	Simpson
Church	Kinzer	Smith (Me.)
Clason	Knutson	Snell
Cluett	Lambertson	Stefan
Colen (N. Y.)	Lemke	Taber
Crawford	Lord	Taylor (Tenn.)
Crowther	Luce	Thomas (N. J.)
Culkin	McLean	Thurston
Dirksen	Maas	Tinkham
Ditter	Mapes	Tobey
Dondero	Martin (Mass.)	Treadway
Dowell	Mason	Wadsworth
Eaton	Michener	Welch
Engel	Mott	White (Ohio)
Englebright	Oliver	Wolcott
Fish	Plumley	Wolfenden
Gamble	Powers	Wolverton
Gearhart	Reece	Woodruff
Gifford		

Progressives: 6

Boileau	Hull	Schneider
Gehrmann	Sauthoff	Withrow

Farm-Laborites: 2

Johnson (Minn.) Kvale

THEY VOTED FOR DICTATORSHIP

Democrats: 191

Aleshire	Greenwood	Murdock (Ariz.)
Allen (Del.)	Gregory	Nelson
Anderson	Griffith	Nichols
Arnold	Griswold	Norton
Atkinson	Haines	O'Brien (Mich.)
Barden	Harlan	O'Brien (Ill.)
Beam	Hart	O'Connell (Mont.)
Biermann	Healey	O'Connell (R. I.)
Binderup	Hennings	O'Day
Boland	Hildebrandt	O'Neill
Boyer	Hill	O'Toole
Bradley	Honeyman	Pace
Brooks	Hook	Patman
Brown (Ga.)	Houston	Patrick
Buckley	Izac	Paterson
Bulwinkle	Jacobsen	Pearson
Byrne	Jenckes	Peterson (Fla.)
Cannon (Mo.)	Johnson (W. Va.)	Pierce
Casey	Johnson (Okla.)	Poage
Celler	Johnson, Luther A. (Texas)	Quinn
Chandler	Johnson, Lyndon (Texas)	Ramsay
Citron	Jones	Randolph
Cochran	Kee	Rayburn
Coffee (Wash.)	Keller	Reilly
Colmer	Kelly (Ill.)	Rigney
Connery	Kelly (N. Y.)	Robinson
Cooley	Keogh	Romjue
Cooper	Kerr	Sabath
Creal	Kirwan	Sacks
Crosby	Kitchens	Sadowski
Crowe	Kniffin	Schaefer
Cullen	Kocilkowski	Schuetz
Curley	Kopplemann	Schulte
Daly	Kramer	Scott
Delaney	Lambeth	Shanley
Dempsey	Lanzetta	Shannon
Demuth	Larabee	Sheppard
Derouen	Levy	Sirovich
Dickstein	Lesinski	Smith (Wash.)
Dies	Lewis (Md.)	Snyder
Dingell	Long	Sparkman
Dockweiler	Luecke	Starnes
Dorsey	McAndrews	Sumners
Doughton	McCormack	Swope
Drew	McGehee	Terry
Duncan	McGranery	Thom
Dunn	McGrath	Thomas (Texas)
Eberharter	McKeough	Thomason
Eicher	McReynolds	Tolan
Farley	McSweeney	Transue
Fernandez	Magnuson	Turner
Fitzgerald	Mahon (S. C.)	Vincent
Fitzpatrick	Maloney	Vinson (Ga.)
Flaherty	Martin (Colo.)	Vinson (Ky.)
Flannagan	Massingale	Voorhis (Calif.)
Flannery	Maverick	Wallgren (Wash.)
Ford (Calif.)	Mead	Warren
Forand	Merritt	Wearin
Fuller	Mills	Wene
Fulmer	Mosier	Whelchel
Gasque	Mouton	Whitington
Gildea	Murdock (Utah)	Williams
Gingery		Wood
Goldsborough		Zimmerman

Progressives: 2

Amlie Havener

Farm-Laborites: 3

Bernard Buckler Teigan

Paired for: 5

Champion	Frey	Wigglesworth
Douglas	Kennedy (N. Y.)	

Paired against: 5

Cartwright	Mitchell (Ill.)	White
Hobbs	Weaver	

Not Voting: 20

Allen (La.)	Fries	Rankin
Bankhead	Hancock (N. C.)	Somers
Boykin	Lucas	Steagall
Caldwell	McFarlane	Sutphin
Colden	Mitchell (Tenn.)	Taylor (Colo.)
Deen	O'Connor (Mont.)	Walters
Drewry	Owen	

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED



FROM THE TOWER

More About The Corporate State

THE principles of the Corporate State may well be applied to our country with a view to perfecting democracy. Contrary to the belief of many, a Corporate State is not necessarily a dictatorial one. It can flourish in an empire, in a kingdom, in a dictatorship or in a democracy. Moreover, it is not a totalitarian state in which all the citizens exist for the welfare of the state instead of the state existing for the welfare of citizen groups.

A Corporate State is predicated on the principle that society is not composed so much of individuals as it is composed of group units with the family being considered as the atom of the state.

These ideals should be adopted in America as we organize to institute a system of democratic government which will permit class to co-operate with class.

First, we must abandon the inefficient system of parties. As a matter of fact, the party system of government was not specifically contemplated by the founding fathers of our Constitution. The origin and development of party-ism was an abuse in the beginning and an abomination at the end. Instead of having the American voters divided artificially into Democrats, Republicans, etc., I propose to have them divided naturally into groups according to vocations and professions.

That system should be replaced by the Corporate State election. This means that instead of being divided into congressional districts, citizens would be divided according to their classification in society. Textile workers must form one class; steel workers, another; motor workers, a third; miners, a fourth; cotton farmers, a fifth; grain farmers, a sixth, etc. Each class of citizens grouped according to its present calling in life will have a representative in Congress whose business it will be really to represent that class.

Moreover, the owners of each industry such as motors, steel, mining, etc., will have equal representation in Congress. Representatives, therefore, will be elected not by the obsolete and artificial rule of mass population, but according to the scientific and practical principle of class representation.

No more political parties with their interminable wranglings, their broken pledges and their tragic inefficiency!

No more antagonism of class against class!

A Corporate State means class for class—class co-operation; it means capital for labor and labor for capital working in harmony; it means the masses for the classes and the classes for the masses operating under the principle of class co-operation.

Representation according to class instead of misrepresentation according to mass demands that the various classes organize as such. A Corporate State pre-supposes that the classes incorporate. This system is predicated upon the organization of steel workers in one compact union; of motor workers in another; of textile workers in a third; of grain farmers, of cotton farmers, of livestock farmers, of professional men in other corporate groups.

It also means the corporate grouping of motor industrialists, of steel industrialists, of railroad owners. Each capitalist will be in his own class organized corporatively; each laborer in his class likewise will be organized in a corporation.

Local units of each corporation will form state units; and state units will form national units, in which both the capitalists have their organizations and the laborers will have theirs. From these organizations they will freely select their own representatives for Congress.

Instead of abolishing Congress through the institution of a dictatorship, let us perfect Congress, our legislative body. This will not be possible, however, unless the majority of citizens in every class organizes in a corporate unit.

My second proposal is related to the presidency of the United States. According to our Constitution the people do not elect the President. As a matter of fact we vote for electors who, in turn, elect a President—electors who are unknown generally to the masses as well as to the classes. Therefore, I propose that we abandon the electoral college and transfer the power of electing the President of the United States to the House of Representatives which House will be composed, as I have just said, of members elected according to class with each class having its own representative.

Instead of creating a dictatorial President, the House of Representatives will choose a President who is its leader. He will be chosen either from among their own members or from outside their members, as they decide. Thus, the office will seek the man instead of the man seeking the office.

Thirdly, I propose that we retain the Senate of the United States with two senators elected from each state, one of whom must represent capital and the other labor, in the wide acceptance of these terms. In one sense, the Senate will be vested with powers superior to those of the House of Representatives. I propose that while the Senate will not be permitted to initiate legislation, nevertheless, it will be necessary for that body to sanction all legislation. The Senate will be presided over by the Vice-President who will also be Secretary of Corporations—that is, under the President and the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Corporations will be the supreme authority over every class corporation in the United States, including all the corporations of every classification of labor, of agriculture and of capital.

The reforms which I have proposed for the House of Representatives obviate the necessity of forming a labor party, an agricultural party, a Republican party or a Democratic party. The only trace of party-ism which will survive will be in the divided opinion of the various class corporations from whom the representatives will spring by a majority vote. It will have little opportunity to function as such on the floor of the House.

Fourthly, I propose that Congress will abandon the present federal system of taxation which has grown burdensome and confiscatory, and will substitute for it a system which will levy taxation according to income and not according to property. This is in harmony with social justice and sound government. It spreads the burden of paying for the maintenance of government according to one's ability to pay and thereby abolishes the hidden consumer tax and all other taxes.

Fifthly, I propose that Congress will declare a ten year moratorium on all federal bond payments and interest payments, thereby enabling industry and commerce, labor and agriculture to husband their resources and profits in this battle not only against depression but against the bulwarks of civilization itself.

Sixthly, I propose that Congress and Congress alone shall have full control over the spending power of the federal government and forthwith will exercise its right to issue and regulate money for the nation.

Seventhly, I propose that it shall be the business of Congress to safeguard the functioning of the law of supply and demand. The productivity of the nation shall be measured upon its ability to consume so that no child shall be hungry or naked, no father shall be needlessly unemployed and no wage-earner shall be paid less than a living, annual wage.

And lastly, I propose that Congress, composed of both the House and the Senate, shall be a silent partner in settling with a finality all questions arising between capital and labor which capital and labor, through their corporations, do not settle by themselves. I do not propose that Congress shall permit government to engage in business and compete with private citizens except in those rare instances, where the public welfare requires public ownership of things which, by their nature, are too important to be entrusted to the care of private individuals. In every sense, Congress shall protect private property and shall endeavor to multiply private ownership.

Father Coughlin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIAL SECURITY, Will It Secure?

by James F. Edwards

Forty-two Old World nations had experimented with social security before the American New Deal adventured to try the panacea. Germany used the taxpayers' funds to wage the World War; England frankly puts the aged worker on the dole; the United States is spending the money, as fast as it is raised, on the Federal deficit.

AN ASSOCIATED PRESS dispatch dated January 3, 1938, is of tremendous importance to every skilled and unskilled worker in the United States, whether he read it or not. The dispatch stated:

"The financial district looked with some favor today on President Roosevelt's budget message to Congress although doubt was expressed in several important Wall Street quarters that the 1939 deficit would be held to $949,000,000.

"The message which pointed out that the deficit would be financed THROUGH THE PURCHASE OF TREASURY OBLIGATIONS WITH THE APPROXIMATE $1,163,000,000 IN SOCIAL SECURITY ACCUMULATIONS WITH THE RESULT THAT THE TREASURY FINANCING WOULD BE CONFINED IN '39 TO REFUNDING OPERATIONS. . . ."

This dispatch, at the time, caused no consternation or fear among that great body of American workmen who paid one per cent of their wage into the Federal Social Security fund during 1937. Few considered the real import of the treasury's action in diverting Social Security funds amounting to $1,163,000,000 to meet a Federal deficit. With a much too humble faith, the worker accepts what Washington does, placing implicit trust in the integrity of the Federal Government. Yet, the question arises whether the fund will actually be distributed for the purpose intended or whether, in the years to come, the Treasury Department will pay deficits or divert it to other uses.

In other words, will Social Security in the present setup of this law passed in 1935, protect the family against the five great hazards constantly threatening its preservation; or will the Social Security law prove to be just another scheme of politicians to avoid public insolvency while the poor continue to suffer?

It will require several articles to consider social security in all its phases, both here and abroad. I will attempt to do that dispassionately and without prejudice. The subject is so interwoven into the whole fabric of social justice that a consideration of one implies the consideration of the other.

Governments, past and present, have cut various patterns in the attempt to secure the family and the individual against the day of need. No two of the patterns are just alike. The pattern of the Fascist dictator is broadly at variance with the pattern of the Communist dictator. The patterns of both differ from the one cut out in a democratic state and from the social security program in France and England. Several have leanings toward the socialistic conception of social security. None of them has fashioned the seamless garment of the Christian ideal which is embodied in the basic principles of social justice.



NO THINKING person, on either side of the Atlantic ocean, denies the necessity of providing for the family in the event of sickness, accident, unemployment, old age, or the death of the bread-winner. The problem of keeping the family above the poverty line is the concern of every individual interested in human welfare. And the problem appears to have grown in an age of mass-productionism, of concentration of wealth, of the widening breach among the classes of mankind. Nor is there hope of its abatement so long as the Christian ideal is shelved in favor of the various neo-pagan patterns cut out by designing politicians, unscrupulous plutocrats and consciousless dictators. The demand for social security and the right to live decently will grow as the numerous schemes prove useless and unavailing. The threat of insecurity will stalk through the nations of the world as a spectre to frighten humankind and to act as a discordant note in the harmonious peace that should exist among the children of Christ.

Forty-two nations had passed social insurance legislation before the United States Government stepped into the social security picture. Germany was the first to try it in 1883. Bismarck was forced to pass laws setting up a health insurance program to placate the German parlor socialists. But the "Iron Chancellor" doubted the value of such legislation, which he called "a golden chain about the necks of the workers."

In 1910, David Lloyd George launching out upon his political career drafted similar laws which were passed in 1911. A distinguished British authority commenting upon the English system has stated: "Essentially, the British plan and the others that have followed it are for the creation of reserves, arbitrarily determined with only the vaguest probabilities which may be drawn against, according to fixed rules. It is, therefore, not astonishing to witness their failure, and to find underlying deficits, loans and subsidies which changed them from reserve fund plans to dole systems."

Unemployment insurance became operative in Germany in 1927. A compulsory contribution of three per cent of the payroll was divided equally between the employer and the employe. The amount proved inadequate and it was raised to three and one-half per cent in 1930. In July, 1930, it was raised to four and one-half per cent, and in October of the same year to six and one-half per cent. In 1929, the government had to subsidize the fund of $94,300,000. In 1930, the subsidy had to be raised to $173,600,000. When the unemployment insurance plan began to operate in 1927 there were 1,370,000 unemployed. In 1931 that number increased to 4,500,000.

Recently, a copy of a German pay envelope came into my possession. It speaks volumes in any discussion relative to the value of social security plans and programs. Translated into the English language and in the United States dollars and cents, this pay envelope offers the following facts and figures:

NAME—Herman Hillenbach.

WAGES—From October 6 to October 12, 1934.

48 hours at 32.84 cents	$15.76
Taxes	3.86
Net	$11.90
Total Wages	$15.76
Tax Free	9.73
	$ 6.03
10% Tax of $6.03	$ .60
Sick Benefit	.53
Old Age Benefit	.51
Disability Insurance	.43
Unemployment Insurance, 2½% of Total Pay	.39
Citizen Tax	.61
Marriage Assistance	.46
Total Deductions	$ 3.53
	$12.23
November 1 there will be	
Worker's Card	$ .22
Widow's Insurance	.11
	$11.90

How Herman Hillenbach was able to live on $11.90 for a week and permit his family to enjoy the barest necessities is known only to Herr Hitler and the Nazis. Nearly 25 per

See SECURITY Page 18

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Rev. Chas. E. Coughlin, LL.D.
EDITORIAL COUNSEL

(By Permission of His Superior)

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just, living, annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property, with government's chief concern for the poor.

It Can Only Happen Here

AMERICANS flooded the nation's capital with telegrams of protest on President Roosevelt's dictatorship bill.

As the wires sparked the popular discontent, as the shower of yellow and blue telegrams poured down around the shoulders of Senators and Representatives, these elected delegates of the people were confronted with a stark dilemma: on the one hand patronage and powerful Administration pressure, on the other, notice of a hostile constituency.

In the Senate, of course, the battle lines had been drawn for many weeks. WPA funds, flood control project funds, agricultural relief funds—all the plums that figure in political party deals, had been promised or threatened with withdrawal by the New Deal patronage dispensers.

Some Senators, it is certain, believed sincerely that their course lay in getting what they could for their constituency regardless of the constituency's dislike for dictatorship. Others, it is equally certain, gave but little heed to the likes of their constituency and voted along the familiar "party line." It is these elected mis-representatives who will destroy Democracy.

In the House, the torrent of telegrams had its fullest effect. One of the discouragements of disinterested public service has ever been the complacency and indifference of the voters. On one hand, the Representative is subjected to official pressure and the skilled persuasion of the interests; on the other, he encounters a silent indifference from the voters back home, many of whom do not even know his name. It is tremendously hard to be a hero under those circumstances; for, to what purpose should a legislator sacrifice patronage, which his district does understand, for a principle that the voters will not appreciate?

The important thing is that an aroused America acted to save itself. The people of the United States, after being warned of the imminent danger, seized the one instrument of Democracy left to them—the right of petition—and hurled a tidal wave of popular protest into the face of the nation's leaders.

It could only happen here. Only under a Democracy such as ours could popular will, aroused spontaneously, override the manipulated will of a governing body.

Let America take its lesson from this incident. Let it remember that Democracy requires vigilance and prompt and complete action. It has learned that dictatorship lurks, and that only popular action can effectually avert it.

Together, Yet Miles Apart

IN HIS speech at Gainsville, Ga., President Roosevelt said: "Men and women in the professions, the overwhelming majority of small storekeepers, a growing number of the bankers and business men—they are coming more and more to see that *the continuation of the American system calls for the elimination of special privilege, the dissemination of the whole truth, and participation in prosperity by the people at the bottom of the ladder, as well as those in the middle and at the top.*"

Take another look at the last part of that declaration. Recognize it? Yes, substantially, it is the program of SOCIAL JUSTICE!

Has the President changed his colors and his methods? Has he happened onto startlingly new knowledge that has changed his course of thought? Are we about to have real, honest-to-goodness reform?

Unfortunately, no. These statements are made by the man who promised to drive the money-changers from the temple, and, instead, resorted to bargaining with them. This declaration is the same that the President has enunciated for the past five years. It is the declaration that has remained unchanged as New Deal program after New Deal program crumbled into the dust of failure. It is the program that sent the nation staggering and reeling along the pathways of collectivism, Federal monopoly, infringement on private business, and experimental state socialism.

Mr. Roosevelt might well have added the name of SOCIAL JUSTICE to the list of those who are "coming to see" the "new" Need. But, we have not only seen this very need, but have demanded—sometimes with more righteous wrath than tact—that these very objectives be sought.

Where then is there conflict? If SOCIAL JUSTICE and the President have the same objectives, why do they not see eye to eye?

For this reason: The President consistently has refused to follow the straight path to the top of the hill. He has insisted upon circling the sides incessantly. He makes a bit of progress here or there, but then slips and slides back to the starting point. Right now he has skidded in the mud and has landed at a point below where he started!

Will he now take the short, direct route to the top? No. The Administration lacks the courage to take the short course: It must skirt the hillsides of socialism, partyism, patronage, pork-barreling, privilege, relief, collectivism, and administrative paternalism.

Thus, while recognizing the merit of the SOCIAL JUSTICE program, the President and his governing syndicate reject in its entirety the SOCIAL JUSTICE blueprint for true reform.

We are together, and yet we are miles apart!

History 'Made In Japan'

THE FEATURE of the President's original reorganization bill which came as the severest shock of surprise to the nation was, perhaps, its inclusion of education laws, envisioned by enforcement of the provision creating a Federal Welfare Department. An Administration-dictated educational policy could rewrite indirectly the history texts and civics books, much as the international bankers' propaganda already has done on the money question.

An Associated Press from Peking, China, reports that Japan is rewriting the history books for use in Chinese schools in the conquered territories. These new Japanese-edited books, says the news dispatch, "will see China just emerging from the dark ages into the sunlight of 'co-operation' with Japan." We quote further:

"New histories overlook China's frequent 'humiliations,' which got so much space in the old Chinese books. Nothing is said about the Japanese seizure of Formosa in 1895, the loss of Korea in 1910, the famous 21 demands of 1915, or the invasion of Manchuria in 1931. . . . The present war is not mentioned, though bombing planes still drone above the schools. The last 10 years of Chinese history seem to be a dark unmentionable secret.

"Teachers are forbidden to speak of Sun Yat Sen and his Nationalist government set up in 1928, or Chiang Kai Shek's armies and the New Life movement."

Thus, the world has another example of a "made-to-order" generation. One reason why an insignificant minority of the Russian people has held the others in abject subjection for so long, is that a post-war generation has been educated in Soviet propaganda. Soviet textbooks teach a version of current history, for example, that would not be recognizable in contrast with the facts of the outside world. But if Russians can be kept from contact with the rest of the world, a universally believed error can be made more effective than the facts.

These rewriters of history would seem to have perverted Shakespeare's wise saw: "Verily, fiction hath in it a higher end than fact." Imperial Japan, in its areas of newest conquest, has taken a page from the Soviet book of experience.

Kerensky Surveys Russia

THE name of Alexander F. Kerensky is almost as legendary to American ears as that of "Doctor Cook." He is remembered as the man who played the fatal fiddle for the Czar. With a dream of twentieth century democracy for the Russian people, Kerensky led the revolution which overturned the empire, and was himself overthrown by a set of bushy haired radicals from New York and Paris cellars, financed by plotting internationalists.

In America for a lecture series, Mr. Kerensky is frankly outspoken about the "moral bankruptcy of bolshevism." Despite the years of despair and failure under the reds, Kerensky still clings to a dream of eventual democracy for his land, when the Communists will have been eliminated by their own feuds and the proven fallacies of their unworkable program.

The downfall of Stalin will come as a natural consequence of the totalitarian regime established by Lenin and Trotsky, so Kerensky says. He added that opposition to Stalin emanates from the more moderate section of the Communist party itself and in the army, who demand a let-up in the dictatorship, particularly in oppression of the peasantry.

"This was the basic idea of the executed Marshal Tukhachevsky and his group," Kerensky told his interviewer. "They demanded abandonment of the irresponsible idea of world revolution, liberation of the peasantry from the serfdom of Stalinist collectivization, restoration of production and improvement in the people's standard of living. For this they were shot. Their program threatened Stalin's power."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America Invaded

by Hon. Fred L. Crawford



THE remarks of Congressman Crawford of Michigan anent the war on crime, quoted in this edition of SOCIAL JUSTICE *from the Congressional Record, indict the laxity of the parole system, but do not touch upon the social conditions which (1) produce the criminal, and (2) militate against his reform once he is released by parole.*

In the first place, the absence of moral training in public education is a fruitful source of crime in America. Acceptance of a belief in God, and recognition of the social obligations imposed by that belief, are too often denied any place in the training of youth. The wonder is not that there is so much crime, but so little.

Generation after generation of such "godless" education cannot but produce a "godless" society. Again, the marvel is that America has done so well. Men, by and large—even among professing Christians—do not always regard their fellow man as brother. With God disregarded and the moral sanctions relaxed, business pursues the law of the jungle; all life becomes a survival of the fittest, "fitness" being the measure of trickery or might. In the underprivileged stratum of society, cleverness to circumvent one's brother finds expression in the petty crimes of youth, and the progressively serious offenses against society which fill our prisons—and our newspaper columns.

With business wrecked by depression and governmental budgets depleted by doles, there is no money for better prison conditions, and paroles offer one method of clearing out crowded cell blocks. Also, a constantly greater number of persons, ignorant of their social obligation for a brother's welfare, regard prison as a place of punishment rather than reform. A materialistic society—not to insist upon the designation "godless"—has little patience with the theorists of the reform groups.

Such influences for reforming the criminal mind as society has time—or money—to provide, are concentrated largely in the better prisons. The result, not infrequently, is that an individual is surrounded by better influences in the reformatory than he will encounter in the society to which he is released by parole.

The existence of crime in America, therefore, and the weakness of its correction, are first of all the reflection of our own unchristian lives. Failure of parole systems, and the political abuse of paroles—through which the underworld is used as an auxiliary by politicians—is another severe count in the indictment against party-ism in America.

—THE EDITOR.

IF RADICAL tendencies are to exist any place in our Government it should be the kind of radicalism shown in the last few years by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in its relentless drive to minimize in America the rule of the hoodlum and the gangster. With an annual crime bill more than twice as large as the cost of operating the Federal Government for the current year, it is no time for mollycoddling.

Police records are replete with instances of parole abuses. It is not the paroled men with determination in their hearts to make good who provoke wrath against the system. It is the men who should not have been paroled in the first place who leave a besmirched trail from the prison door that makes the going all the more hard for the man who wants to go straight upon his release under parole.

THE Ninety-first Annual Report of the Prison Association of New York contains some statistics worthy of serious thought in consideration of the parole system. That association obtained information from 133 different institutions, and it found that 42 institutions had no parole officers for 12,182 parolees and 36 institutions had one parole officer each—of a total of 36 for 8,566 parolees.

It has been estimated by the Prison Association of New York that not more than six or seven states and the Federal Government have what can be termed suitable and scientific methods.

The root of our evil is not a matter of Federal jurisdiction. When the people of the states become sufficiently aroused to jam the brakes on the machinery by which a felon with a previous record may be carelessly paroled, and when parole systems are divorced from politics, then we may find reason to be more soft-spoken about turning men with criminal records back onto society.

Until some other system of checking upon parolees is adopted, other than that of no supervision or contact at all, or that of merely mail correspondence with them, I am inclined to take the word of the persons who are hired to protect society from the criminal. The chief of detectives in one of our southern cities said: "Sixty per cent of the time of our department is spent running down crimes committed by paroled convicts and 65 per cent of the above-mentioned crimes are committed by paroled, former, or escaped convicts." The attorney general of a western state comments: "The present parole system is not working. It fails to protect society and fails to rehabilitate the criminal."

From an official United States Government publication, "Uniform Crime Reports," we find that 13,602 persons were convicted in 23,869 crimes. This record further shows that 2,802 of these criminals were recipients of paroles on various occasions during their careers of lawlessness, and in 1,014 cases they were thereafter arrested before the expiration of their parole period. In other words, 36.2 per cent of the paroles extended to these major criminals were violated by the recipients.

In addition, there were 1,126 persons who apparently lived within the law during the parole period but who were arrested subsequently to the expiration of the parole.

This indicates that 76.4 per cent of the 2,802 major criminals who were given paroles were subsequently arrested, either while on parole or after expiration of the parole period. This report further shows that with reference to the 1,014 individuals arrested while on parole, the records indicate that two-thirds of them were charged with murder, rape, robbery, kidnaping and other felonies.

With a record of one criminal homicide in the United States every 39 minutes in 1937, with some citizen robbed every nine minutes, and with someone's car stolen every two and one-half minutes, it is time we put a stop to coddling criminals. It is not a time to sit on the sidelines and shout, editorially or otherwise, for law-enforcement agencies to split their ranks.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Will the Gentleman Yield?"



Morgan Dismissal Is Seen as an Act of Fascism

By HON. HAMILTON FISH
Representative from New York

UP TO A few weeks ago Arthur E. Morgan, chairman of the TVA, was regarded by the Administration as a great public servant and as the outstanding authority on flood control and water power. Since he has made the charges of dishonesty, malfeasance, and bad faith, the Administration seems to have changed its attitude in regard to the great services rendered by Arthur Morgan as chairman of the TVA. The President of the United States, instead of referring these charges to the Congress to be investigated, decided in a most autocratic manner to investigate the charges himself. Mr. Morgan thought the President was prejudiced and refused to testify in detail.

The President proceeded and acted as judge and jury, as prosecuting attorney and as lord high executioner, and dismissed Chairman Morgan.

I submit to the members of this House, regardless of partisanship, that this is the beginning of Fascism in the United States. This is not only the beginning but this is Fascism in line with what occurs in Germany, in Italy, and Russia. It is part and parcel of the OGPU system of Soviet Russia. A one-man trial and a great public servant has his head cut off and no demand is made by the President for a thorough investigation by the Congress of the United States.

I submit that the action of President Roosevelt was high-handed, arbitrary, and ruthless, in defiance of the Congress and in violation of the laws of the land.

The Congress set up a separate agency with semi-legislative and possibly semi-judicial powers. It demanded that the TVA be a separate agency by itself, and it specifically wrote into the law the requirement that the Congress, by concurrent resolution, should remove any of the directors. This was written into the law in specific language. The President of the United States, however, in violation of that law, took it upon himself to remove Dr. Morgan. Unmindful of his removal of Mr. Humphrey from the Federal Trade Commission, which action was held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, the President proceeds and removes Dr. Morgan, a far worse case because of the specific limitation written into the TVA Act by the Congress. That is why I purposely and deliberately state that this autocratic and high-handed act of the President is an act of Fascism.

Taxes Take All Hope of Profit

By HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
Representative from Michigan

IN THE city of Lansing, Michigan, there is a corporation known as the Motor Wheel Corporation. Last year they paid in city taxes, $51,331.74; State taxes, $61,995.71; State unemployment insurance, $107,872.39; Federal taxes, $427,144; Federal old-age taxes, $53,633.57; and Federal unemployment taxes, $11,452.06.

This tax represented $237.89 for every man employed in that plant. It also represented a tax of 83 cents on every share of stock of that corporation.

What is worse, it represented 28.5 per cent of the gross income of that industry. In addition, the company employes contributed $53,000 to the Federal Government's old-age benefit fund from their 1937 pay checks.

It may be somewhat surprising and amazing to you to know that the public debt in the last 27 years has risen 3,100 per cent, or more than 100 per cent for every year that has elapsed in that period of time. You may be interested in knowing that the per capita debt of the Federal Government has risen from $12.69 in 1910 to $281.63, or an increase of 2,120 per cent in 27 years. How long can the Federal Government travel in this direction before we arrive at the brink of bankruptcy?

Internal Help Most Important Now

By HON. JOHN LUECKE
Representative from Michigan

MUCH has been said on the floor in recent days and weeks in regard to war and world conditions in general; but it seems that we continue to disregard conditions at home. To my way of thinking, unemployment is one of the vital questions facing this Congress, and one which should be discussed more freely than it has been. It is vital to our democratic institutions to restore these 12,000,000 unemployed men to work. We should find work for them in industry. Of course, the WPA cannot go on forever, and, besides, these men do not want to stay on relief for the rest of their lives.

In 1937, last year, when production was up to 92 per cent of normal, taking the production figures of 1929 as the basis, there were still 7,000,000 unemployed. In order to put those 7,000,000 men back to work, production would have had to go far above the 1929 figure. What does that mean? It means these 7,000,000 workers will remain permanently unemployed, and that is the problem facing the American people today.

I do not like the idea of building a wall of steel around this nation and have it decay in the center. That is the real danger to our democracy. *We have got to put these men back on the job.*

America Would Buy If It Had Any Money

By HON. KENT E. KELLER
Representative from Illinois

THE only hope for a revived and prosperous textile industry lies in raising the wage income, not in the South alone, but also of several million families North, East, South and West, so that they can buy the food, the clothes, and the household furnishings they need and are now denied. They are buying only the most meager supplies because they haven't the money to buy more. If all the people in America alone had the income to buy what they need, and would be only too glad to work for it, we could not raise enough cotton to supply the demand. The same idea applies to food products. Why do we not open our eyes to this fact?

Let us take a look at the tobacco industry in the South. It was our first export industry. Its products are in universal demand and use. It should be one of our great stabilizing industries. What has it done for labor and the tobacco farmer? It has made millions for a top few and misery for those who produce and process the tobacco.

I will now give you a few authentic, official facts which until now have not been made public. In 1911 the Supreme Court dissolved the tobacco trust. From that day the Big Three companies—American, Liggett and Meyers, and the Reynolds Co.—have had about 85 per cent of the business. During the 23 years, 1912 to 1934, these three companies made net profits of $1,245,000,000! Fantastic but true. The Reynolds Co. alone made in that period $444,000,000, with an original investment of less than $16,000,000. Until recently the president of the American Tobacco Co. was paid more than $1,000,000 annually. In 1934, the average annual income of the 400,000 tobacco farmers was only $411.12. This one tobacco executive received more compensation than the average annual income of 2,500 tobacco farmers.

Do you gentlemen think we can build a stable industry on these profits and wages and farm price policies? I think you will agree with me that these policies are leading straight to economic suicide.

That you do not need as good houses, as good clothing, and as good furniture in the South as you do in the North is nonsense. When you say men can live cheaper in the South than they can in the North, you ought to add "provided they are willing to exist on a lower standard of living." Because even in the tropics all who can afford them have just as good houses, as good clothing, as good living conditions as the people of the same economic status in our own country.

Currency Contracted While Charge Is Denied

By HON. FINLY H. GRAY
Representative from Indiana

EARLY in last year, 1937, misled by the demand to balance the budget—in the midst and strain of depression, when neither public nor private budgets can be balanced—the Government entered upon the policy of the suspension and relief of recovery payments, relying upon complaining private industry to take up employment where the public left off.

At this critical transition time, when new and additional money was needed to make up or take the place of the relief and recovery payments withdrawn, the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board deliberately and secretly entered upon a drastic contraction of the public currency.

Last March, a year ago, 1937, Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board prepared and published an official statement denying the charge of currency contraction. But the contraction of the currency was continued until more than three billions of currency and credit were withdrawn from use and circulation.

It was these two concurrent currency movements, the withdrawal of relief and recovery payments and the contraction of currency and credit, carried on together, at the same time, that brought the fall of values and the price level and the 1937 relapse of the 1929 panic.

I have long protested and warned against this secret control of the public currency by the private Federal Reserve bankers. But all has been fruitless and in vain.

War Profiteers Take Greater Dividends

By HON. W. D. McFARLANE
Representative from Texas

THERE is a 10 per cent limitation now on naval ship and naval aircraft construction, and the members of the House are entitled to know how it is being administered. The 10 per cent profit limitation on naval ship construction and aircraft construction has been on now for nearly four years, but it is under the operation and administration of the Navy Department and the Treasury Department and under the rules and regulations they have written, they have turned it all over to the shipbuilders' combine and the Aircraft Trust with the result the Government has realized less than $10,000 in revenue under the regulations they have made, and yet the ship and aircraft companies' records show they are making large profits. The record shows they are making the profits, but we are not getting any tax money as a result of this 10 per cent limitation into the Treasury of the United States. But, beyond that, look at the profit of these large concerns.

The United States Steel Corporation, between 1914 and 1918, during the World War, declared dividends amounting to more than $350,000,000. Standard Oil, in the year 1918 alone, made a profit and declared dividends of more than $450,000,000. You can go through the entire category of these corporations and see that they all made similar or comparable profits. The du Ponts, on an investment of $74,000,000, had increased that investment at the end of the war to more than $300,000,000 from net profits they made during the war, and that is the way these profiteers are going. If you want to deal seriously with this proposition, you should consider this phase of it.

We have not been able to put any limitation in any of these laws that would take the profits out of or limit the profits on any of these war-material manufacturers, and I frankly say to you that these matters were seriously considered while the President of the United States was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and the records show that he could not deal with the matter and take the profits out of war, and no Congress has been able to do this.

Let us seriously consider this matter and see if we cannot accomplish the purpose by building all these ships under the supervision of the Government of the United States. I want to commend this seriously to your consideration. I believe this is the only answer to these war scares we are everlastingly having every year when the private shipbuilders and the aircraft manufacturers insist on increasing the appropriations for this purpose.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED



The Tragedy of Spain

by Luis Perez De Olaguer-Feliu

Not Social Injustice, But Agitation by Envious Foreigners of a Contented and Prosperous People, Created the Ruinous Revolution. So Discloses This Native Son of Iberia Who Remembers Barcelona as a Cultured and Happy City.

I AM a Spaniard visiting in the United States. I have read in SOCIAL JUSTICE of February 28th the article by James F. Edwards under the title "Social Injustice." I do not agree that the whole blame, or the greatest, for what is going on in Spain is to be placed on the social injustices in monarchistic Spain. Russian interference is not sufficiently emphasized in the Edwards article.

Though I now live in the Philippine Islands, I went very often to Barcelona. My father and brothers were residents there. The Reds killed my father and brother; we were very fortunate that the rest of the relatives escaped, but we have been very much persecuted. Our property was seized.

In this Spanish war one must distinguish between two periods. The beginning of it was characterized by the persecution of religion—by the burning of churches and the killing of priests and innocent citizens, accompanied with brutality and cruelty. The second part of this revolution was the wrong policy of Mr. Anthony Eden, the British Foreign Secretary, whose supporters were Laborite. With his hate of dictators, Eden was not willing to co-operate with Hitler and Mussolini and with General Franco, in helping the cause of civilization.

Instead, the so-called "democratic" parties consented to international brigades, composed of despicable people, men without discipline and for whose actions the government was not willing to be responsible. These invaders came into Spain to kill those in revolt against Russian innuendoes on free Christian civilization. In this way the war, which could have been finished in a short time and with much less sacrifice of life, has been prolonged for many months. Spain has been crucified on a battlefield of international rivalries and of incompatible ideologies.

Government money served to buy arms which were given to the people. The people of Barcelona were reluctant despite encouragement from the government and when General Baret decided not to follow Senor Compayns, just 400 soldiers were more than sufficient, and thousands of people voluntarily surrendered arms and ammunition in the streets. I was convinced at that time that revolution would never be possible in Barcelona, as so very few were willing to fight.

The great trouble with the Rightist party, which made a coalition with Senor Lerroux, was that they were too mild and refused to punish or put to death those responsible for the revolutionary outbreak of 1934. So those forces that were successful in undermining Primo de Rivera and King Alfonso XIII continued working to undermine the coalition of Senor Lerroux. Many incidents followed, but they obtained Senor Azana, traitor to the country, who was nominated president of the republic and Senor Alcala Zamora quit the presidency, declaring that Spain no longer was a republic.

Senor Azana, with unbelievable tenacity, continued to dislocate the army, to recreate militias under his control, to disarm reliable people and put arms and munitions into the hands of the lower classes and persons in whom had been stirred the hate of classes. When the revolution started, fearing that they would still not be successful in creating chaos, or terrorize so many people not in agreement with them, they opened the doors of the prisons and gave arms and ammunition to Spain's worst criminals, to those whom they knew would never again be under anyone's control.

It could happen here, if the politicians, through greed and the desire to obtain votes, imposed on the minds of the voters and made them revolt, and if the government disrupted the army and gave arms and ammunition to Communists and the low class people.

I AM convinced, after traveling extensively around the world, that there was no country where life and conditions were so prosperous, wealth so evenly distributed, and where people were living on so fine and sound a standard as in Barcelona. And it was right in Barcelona where those wonderful, conservative, and even religious, people, have been subjected to terror and have gone from government leadership to the terrible dictatorship of these ruthless few.

Just fifteen days before the revolution I had a talk with a foreman repairing my house in a small town near Barcelona. He told me that the laborers were contented and were fed up with strikes and that Catalan workers would never revolt. I shall never forget the beauty of our country, so peaceful and lovely, and the friendly conversations I had with the two laborers who accompanied me and lived closely with me for two days. They were happy and contented.

One of them told me that in his town, a small village named Agua Freda, out of a thousand people there were fewer than twenty who believed in Communism, but that from time to time men came from Barcelona making terrifying speeches and they feared what they might do some day.

And so, as much as I could not believe it, it happened as the men told me. A few agitators terrorized the population and then international brigades broke into Spain and, under the masquerade of "defending democracy," that contented, honest, conservative and bourgeois population of Catalonia has been desecrated, subjected to tyranny, and punished to the point that I can hardly refrain from crying when I am reminded of it.

I should be very glad if I can help to remove the impression that may have been, unintentionally, created that social injustice was the only or main reason for the revolution in Spain; and to stress instead the foreign

See SPAIN Page 18

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Want LEADERSHIP

by Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D.

Despite Five Years of Diagnosis and Inefficient Experiment, the Patient Lingers On—and So Does the Doctor. The Serum of Social Justice Remains To Be Tried on the Body Politic.

IT IS no time to move when there is sickness in the household. It is no time to bring painters into the house in order to change the decorations. Ladders and scaffolding are not the desirable equipment of a sick room.

In times of sickness, physicians and nurses and religious leaders are the most welcome personnel in the life of the patient. It is not the time to invite the patient's uncles and aunts and cousins and nephews and nieces for any extended visit. It is not the time to fill the ears of the patient with the family troubles of the people across the way. The patient needs rest and quiet and a chance to exercise his own natural recuperative powers.

Even the family budget must be renovated in the face of sickness. Money that may be needed for medicines and for possible surgery and hospitalization is not lavishly expended in buying a new silver service set from Ovington's or Tiffany's.

The head of the household has one prominent and predominant duty. He must take care of his own. He must expend all his energy upon the recovery of his charge. Only then can he expect the patient to recover and to become once again a wage earner for the general welfare of the family to which he belongs.

All of this reasoning, which becomes so self-evident when applied to the conduct of a single household in times of illness, is similarly applicable to a nation in economic distress.

The United States of America is sick. It is troubled with the ulcers of an economic depression. There is something wrong with the distributive processes of the body politic. For nearly 10 years diagnosis after diagnosis has been handed down from all sorts of brain trusters and brain dusters and brain busters.

On March 4, 1933, the patient itself chose a new Chief-Medico whose promise of a New Dealish Therapy gave hope to the patient's tired mind. For four years there were governmental X-Rays and governmental Exploratory Operations and governmental Vaccines and governmental Massages and governmental Ointments and governmental Pills and governmental Sedatives. And still the patient lay sick in bed.

Undaunted by the failure of four years, the patient rallied to the fireside voice of the Chief-Medico and re-engaged him for another four years, with the courtesy understanding, as has been the custom of our country since George Washington, that this would be the last period of experimentation on a New Dealish Therapy basis.

Several therapeutic novelties had been broached by the Chief-Medico during the first four years which should have put the patient on his guard. There were many times when the new Chief-Medico wanted no one in on the case but himself. The family representatives of the patient had been crowded into a corner of the room and, on certain occasions, completely out of the room in the Chief-Medico's attempt to allocate every phase of the patient's life unto himself.

But the sick are even more hopeful than the healthy. The Chief-Medico was given another contract. And the economic strength of the patient has continued to waste away.

THE SOURCE of the trouble was manifest. The streptococcus of social injustice had entered the body politic of the patient generations ago. It had extended its empire of

disease until every organ in the patient's body was sick and sore and slavish.

The remedy for the ills was likewise manifest. An injection of social justice would begin the cure immediately. Continued injections of the serum of social justice would infallibly restore the national patient unto health. Home Relief Powders and Works Progress Pills were only sedatives. They had to be used but they should have been used only pending the time when, after four years of Charts and Curves and Symptoms, the Serum of Social Justice would have been prepared and injected in wholesale and healing quantities.

One year of the Chief-Medico's second four-year contract has passed by and the patient is no better than in the beginning. The streptococcus of social injustice is dancing more merrily through the blood stream.

Meanwhile, the Chief-Medico himself is enjoying life to the fullest. His professional salary is $75,000 a year. That is not enough, he argues, to keep him in executive gauze. Therefore he sells his diagnoses of the first four years for the same amount. And the patient, who was at least the raw material of the diagnoses which the Chief-Medico sells for $75,000, is not receiving a single penny of it.

The Chief-Medico's visits to the sick room have been cut short. They have also diminished in number. The Chief-Medico has been too busy setting his own healthy son up in business—rather, in two or more businesses—so that filial genius may have many financial fields to plow.

The Chief-Medico has been too busy inviting other patients from abroad. He has heard that there are sick people in Germany and Italy and Spain and Russia and Austria. As Chief-Medico of the greatest national patient in the world he knows that his words will be listened to, even if half or more than half of his patients at home are tired of his pills and sedatives and fireside psychoanalyses. With no cure in sight for his own patient and with little room in the sick chamber, he invites the sick from every country abroad to come and join the clinical procession in America.

The Chief-Medico has also been busy trying to rip the wall paper from the sick room, to add assistants to his staff—assistants with a "passion for anonymity," as he expresses it, despite the fact that he himself has never been keen in the practice or the processes of anonymity.

And still the patient lingers on between life and death. And there is no one in authority to cure him.

This little expedition in the modern literary field of Walt Disney is not an allegory. It is a presentation of facts, executive facts, in the present condition of the United States of America.

SUFFERING for nearly 10 years from the scourge of an economic depression, whose roots are in social injustice, the American people, Walt Whitman-wise, are crying out for social justice and for leadership. There is handwriting of a possible cure upon the wall. Delineated against the horizon of hope and security are the 16 principles of Father Coughlin. American citizens remember that it was Father Coughlin who diagnosed their ills, accurately and fundamentally and hopefully. They know that the only remedies which have alleviated a single one of their ills have been drawn from these 16 principles as from a fountain head.

In 1932, and again in 1936, the American electorate chose Franklin D. Roosevelt to be their political leader.

Their hopes have been builded on sand. They are sheep without a shepherd. They are a people without proper elected leadership.

The country cries out for Social Justice. What is the President doing about it? Through his Executive Reorganization Bill he seeks to increase the dictatorial powers of his office, to control the entire Civil Service of the nation in his own hands.

The country cries out for an annual living wage, for the abolition of non-productive bonds, for a discontinuance of issuing tax-free bonds which bring riches to the rich and impose greater poverty upon the poor. Eleven million people are still out of work. One out of six in New York City alone is on some form of "relief roll." And what is the President doing about it?

He issues a call to the political refugees of the world to come to America and to swell the ranks of unemployment.

We want Social Justice. We want leadership. There will be time for everything else.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED



Published in 1937, at $2.50, by Sheed and Ward, Inc., 65 Fifth Avenue, New York

SYNOPSIS *A young man of 23, Damien de Veuster quitted Belgium for the Hawaiian Islands, where, after 10 years of successful labor among the natives, he heroically took up residence for the rest of his life among the lepers in that place of despair, the pesthole of Molokai. Through his boundless energy the leper settlement was entirely remade in the spirit of hope and cheerfulness, but not without constant struggle with the authorities. He had no fear of the leprosy, which he felt sure would one day attack him. When after 12 years it did, when it had eaten its way into his whole body, he would not die, but battled off death relentlessly as he endeavored to put his reform on a permanent basis. The last few months of his life, however, were made happy by the arrival of workers who would be his permanent successors, the Franciscan Sisters. And now that he was sure his work would go on, his great soul winged its flight to its Creator. Immediately, his praises were sung throughout the whole world.*

CHAPTER NINE

AMIDST all the concordance of praise that followed upon Damien's death there was one dissenting note: the pen of the Rev. Charles McEwen Hyde, a Congregational minister living in Honolulu, was at work, answering a colleague in Australia who had written for information about the suddenly famous Damien.

Letter of Rev. C. McE. Hyde:

"Honolulu, August 2, 1889

"Rev. H. B. Gage

"Dear Brother: In answer to your inquiries about Father Damien, I can only reply that we who knew the man are surprised at the extravagant newspaper laudations, as if he was a most saintly philanthropist. The simple truth is, he was a coarse, dirty man, headstrong and bigoted. He was not sent to Molokai, but went there without orders; did not stay at the leper settlement (before he became one himself), but circulated freely over the whole island (less than half the island is devoted to the lepers), and he came often to Honolulu. He had no hand in the reforms and improvements inaugurated, which were the work of our Board of Health, as occasion required and means provided. He was not a pure man in his relations with women, and the leprosy of which he died should be attributed to his vices and carelessness. Others have done much for the lepers, our own ministers, the government physicians, and so forth, but never with the Catholic idea of meriting eternal life.—Yours, etc.

—C. M. HYDE."

On receipt of this amazing letter, the Rev. Mr. Gage displayed the bad judgment of sending it to the Sydney *Presbyterian,* where, unluckily for the clergyman of Honolulu, it was seen by Robert Louis Stevenson.

Unlike Stevenson, Hyde had met Damien. In fact, only four years before the priest's death—this seems to have been unknown to Stevenson—he had written an account of a visit to the leper settlement which was printed in the *Hawaiian Gazette.* In this article he had described Damien as "That noble-hearted Catholic priest who went to Molokai in 1873 to care for the spiritual welfare of those of his faith and whose work has been so successful."

Only four years separated the praise from the slander, and in that brief interval his subject had been a dying and finally a dead man. The only explanation Hyde ever gave for this sudden change of heart was to offer proof that Damien was of peasant birth and that such a fact was "presumptive proof that I had equally good reason for saying what else I said in regard to him!"

Stevenson visited Molokai a short time after Damien's death and remained eight days. He frankly records that he was *"suspicious of Catholic testimony* and avoided, as much as was possible, the prejudices and enthusiasms of any who might be friendly to the priest. He talked with those *"who had sparred and wrangled with him; who beheld him with no halo . . . Protestants who had opposed the father in his life . . ."* With some cause, perhaps, for rancor, these antagonists of Damien had no great ills to report of him.

IN SYDNEY, somebody attracted Stevenson's attention to Hyde's letter. Anger would be a mild word to describe the author's reaction. His wife reported that he beat his head and locked himself in a room where he muttered aloud as he wrote. He knew Hyde, and in fact had been a guest at the clergyman's home but he had also been to Molokai, and the words that sprang from the angry writer that day comprise a far greater monument to the leper priest than any structure of stone could possibly be.

Robert Louis Stevenson's letter to the Rev. C. McE. Hyde:

"Sydney, February 25, 1890

"Sir:

"It may probably occur to you that we have met, and visited, and conversed; on my side, with interest. You may remember that you have done me several courtesies, for which I was prepared to be grateful. But there are duties which come before gratitude, and offenses which justly divide friends, far more acquaintances. Your letter to the Reverend H. B. Gage is a document, which, in my sight, if you had filled me with bread when I was starving, if you had sat up to nurse my father when he lay a-dying, would yet absolve me from the bonds of gratitude.

"You know enough, doubtless, of the process of canonization to be aware that, 100 years after the death of Damien, there will appear a man charged with the painful office of the *devil's advocate.* After that noble brother of mine, and of all frail clay, shall have lain a century at rest, one shall accuse, one defend him. The circumstance is unusual that the devil's advocate should be a volunteer, should be a member of a sect immediately rival, and should make haste to take upon himself his ugly office ere the bones are cold; unusual, and of a taste which I shall leave my readers free to qualify; unusual, and to me inspiring...

". . . If in aught that I shall say I should offend others, your colleagues, whom I respect and remember with affection, I can but offer them my regret I am not free, I am inspired by the consideration of interests far more large; and such pain as can be inflicted by anything from me must be indeed trifling when compared with the pain with which they read your letter. It is not the hangman, but the criminal, that brings dishonor on the house.

"You belong, sir, to a sect—I believe my sect, and that in which my ancestors labored—which has enjoyed, and partly failed to utilize, an exceptional advantage in the islands of Hawaii . . . This is not the place to enter into the degree or causes of their failure, such as it is. One element alone is pertinent, and must here be plainly dealt with. In the course of their evangelical calling, they—or too many of them—grew rich. It may be news to you that the houses of missionaries are a cause of mocking on the streets of Honolulu. It will at least be news to you, that when I returned your civil visit, the driver of my cab commented on the size, the taste, and the comfort of your home . . .

"Your sect (and remember, as far as any sect avows me, it is mine) has not done ill in a worldly sense in the

Hawaiian Kingdom. When calamity befell their innocent parishioners, when leprosy descended and took root in the Eight Islands a *quid pro quo* was to be looked for. To that prosperous mission, and to you as one of its adornments, God had sent at last an opportunity. I know I am touching here upon a nerve acutely sensitive. I know that others of your colleagues look back on the inertia of your church, and the intrusive and decisive heroism of Damien, with something almost to be called remorse. I am sure it is so with yourself; I am persuaded your letter was inspired by a certain envy, not essentially ignoble, and the one human trait to be espied in that performance. You were thinking of the lost chance, the past day; of that which should have been conceived and was not; of the service due and not rendered. *Time was,* said a voice in your ear, in your pleasant room, as you sat raging and writing; and if the words written were base beyond parallel, the rage, I am happy to repeat—it is the only compliment I shall pay you—the rage was almost virtuous. But, sir, when we have failed, and another has succeeded; when we have stood by, and another has stepped in; when we sit and grow bulky in our charming mansions, and a plain, uncouth peasant steps into the battle, under the eyes of God, and succors the afflicted, and consoles the dying, and is himself afflicted in his turn, and dies upon the field of honor—the battle cannot be retrieved as your unhappy irritation has suggested. It is a lost battle, and lost forever. One thing remained to you in your defeat—some rags of common honor; and these you made haste to cast away."

AFTER dwelling upon the harrowing experience of his visit to Molokai, Stevenson then sets down a list of Damien's faults collected from those who opposed him. The worst of these were, according to them, his officiousness and indiscretion. Stevenson continues:

". . . We will (if you please) go hand in hand through the different phases of your letter, and candidly examine each from the point of view of its truth, its appositeness, and its charity.

"Damien was *coarse.*

"It is very possible. You make us sorry for the lepers who had only a coarse old peasant for their friend and father. But you, who were so refined, why were you not there, to cheer them with the lights of culture? . . .

"Damien was *dirty.*

"He was. Think of the poor lepers annoyed with this dirty comrade! But the clean Dr. Hyde was at his food in a fine house.

"Damien was *headstrong.*

"I believe you are right again; and I thank God for his strong head and heart.

"Damien was *bigoted.*

"I am not fond of bigots myself, because they are not fond of me. But what is meant by bigotry, that we should regard it as a blemish in a priest? Damien believed his own religion with the simplicity of a peasant or a child; as I would suppose that you do . . . But the point of interest in Damien, which has caused him to be so much talked about and made him at last the subject of your pen and mine, was that, in him, his bigotry, his intense and narrow faith, wrought potently for good, and strengthened him to be one of the world's heroes and exemplars.

"Damien *was not sent to Molokai, but went there without orders.*

"Is this a misreading? or do you really mean the words for blame? I have heard Christ, in the pulpits of our church, held up for imitation on the ground that His sacrifice was voluntary. Does Dr. Hyde think otherwise? . . .

"Damien *had no hand in the reforms, etc.*

". . . I tell you that, to a mind not prejudiced by jealousy, all the reforms of the lazaretto, and even those which he most vigorously opposed, are properly the work of Damien. They are the evidence of his success; they are what his heroism provoked from the reluctant and the careless. Many were before him in the field . . . Before his day, even you will confess, they had effected little. It was his part, by one striking act of martyrdom, to direct all men's eyes on that distressful country. At a blow, and

See DAMIEN Page 16

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New Book and a New Man

by Leon Hamilton

The Busiest Professor at Yale Has Been Induced To Become No. 1 Trust Buster For the New Deal. His Philosophy, as Disclosed in His Writings, Runs Parallel With That of the Brain Trusters—Little Trusts Are to be "Busted" to Pave the Way for Bigger Federal Monopolies.

WHEN the Senate Committee was investigating the appointment of Prof. Thurman W. Arnold of Yale, to be chief New Deal trust-buster, the Washington book stores ran out of Arnold's book, "The Folklore of Capitalism." Proprietors of the book shops—and the Yale University Press—thought there was a sufficient supply to last for years.

Congressmen started the bull book market, searching the professor's writings for indications of what this man Arnold believed and what he might do about capitalism, collectivism, planned economy, big business, and private property.

Now, the professional book reviewers have never been able to agree whether the Arnold book is a contribution to modern thought and progress, or whether it is trivial or important. If the professional reviewers could get nothing out of the book, there is little wonder that Congressmen approved of the new Rooseveltian appointment. Congressmen are accustomed to vote approval for most everything that they do not understand; for the very reason that they do not understand it.

Prof. Arnold's book thus expresses his creed in regard to anti-trust laws: "Pressure gave rise to the anti-trust laws which appeared to be a complete prohibition of large corporations . . . the same pressure made the enforcement of the anti-trust laws a pure ritual. . . . Trust busting, therefore, became one of the great moral issues of the day, while at the same time great combinations thrived and escaped regulation."

Seeming to say what you do not say, and actually saying the opposite, is an old Harvardian trick quite generally employed by the trust busters and brain trusters of the Frankfurter-Landis-Tugwell type. In the laws framed by the Frankfurter proteges, such as the NRA, AAA, TVA, Farm Control, Government Reorganization and Navy bills, the same psychology of deception is employed to perfection.

A haphazard reading of these bills—and Congressmen are great haphazard readers of bills—will not uncover the true meaning or purpose of any one of them. In fact, a cursory reading of the bills actually makes them seem to have other meanings and other purposes. In a trick phrasing, hedged in with legal expressions and legalistic devices, and a few "and/or" combinations, the true meaning of the bill and its real purpose are disclosed.

Prof. Arnold maintains that big business, which inspired the anti-trust laws, also caused the laws to remain unenforceable. In other words, big business employed the anti-trust laws in a psychology of deception calculated to inspire the unthinking public with the conviction that the law had legislated big corporations out of existence. Thus the anti-trust laws actually protected the large trusts and monopolies, by distracting public attention from them, and enabling them to prosecute competing smaller trusts and independent owners and producers. Hence, the anti-trust laws had a double purpose—to destroy competition and to preserve monopolies and trusts.

The Chief Executive agrees with Professor Arnold. All trusts and monopolies must be destroyed in order to create and to preserve governmental-owned and operated super-monopolies such as NRA, AAA, NLRB and TVA. The Government monopoly of a new industrial NRA, envisioned in the Wage-Hours Bill, will outlaw and destroy great industrial monopolies now operating in business. The new AAA, created by the Farm Control Bill, will destroy competing monopolies in agriculture. The National Labor Relations Board, already established in the Wagner Bill, will outlaw the unions now monopolizing the field of labor. While the TVA, set up in the same bill, will destroy all utility and transportation holding companies operating in the field of power.

Of course, the Government will control these alphabetical and monopolistic agencies; but who will control the Government? The chances are that the greatest of all monopolies, which now controls industry, agriculture, labor and utilities—the Federal Reserve Bank, owned and operated by internationalists—will control Government monopolies by continuing and consolidating its control of Government. In the meantime, all private owners and operators in industry, agriculture, labor and utilities will be legislated out of existence by a collectivistic and socialistic financial super-monopoly.



PROF. THURMAN W. ARNOLD

Although Professor Thurman W. Arnold was the busiest man in Yale Law School, he has taken upon himself the additional responsibility of Assistant United States Attorney General, in charge of the Justice Department's division of trust-busting.

Some thirty years ago, young Arnold came galloping out of the west, studied law at Princeton, graduated in law at Harvard, grabbed off his master's and doctor's degrees at Yale, held a post as dean of West Virginia, after practising law for a time in his native town of Laramie, Wyoming. Later he went to Yale as professor of law. Holding the much sought after and avidly coveted berth of Lafayette professor of law, Professor Arnold will probably be projected into national eminence as the most publicized of New Deal personalities.

In the past, Prof. Arnold also has been trial examiner for the S.E.C. and an aide of Governor General Frank Murphy in creating the Sugar Commission for the Philippines.

—The Editor

PROFESSOR ARNOLD is a Harvardian law maker and a Frankfurter collectivist, fanatically devoted to the Socialistic New Deal and rabidly antagonistic to the Old Deal. He desires to destroy the traditional old order with its tabus and sacred cows, and to create the new order of planned economy with its creed of totalitarianism and its code of state absolutism. The professor, like other professors of the brain trust, hates entrenched capitalists—even to the extent of refusing to condemn the sitdown strikes!

In 1934, he said: "Today, for the first time, the problems of the United States are being worked out by a Chief Executive who is frankly an experimentalist. It is impossible even to estimate the vast progress that will be made in 100 years, if Roosevelt's methods of experiment are continued."

Professor Arnold agrees with Dr. Roosevelt that the old order must be destroyed and a new order must be created in its ruin and destruction.

The anti-trust legislation now on the books, and anti-trust legislation to be enacted, must be enforced to destroy the "monopoly" of smaller owners and independent producers who control American industry and agriculture—the little business man and the small farmer. The enforcement of anti-trust legislation will establish Government super-monopolies, for which Professor Arnold has such a manifest predilection.

Professor Arnold combines a knowledge of Harvardian law with planned economy; hence, he will be more fitted than even his predecessor, Robert Jackson, to carry out the legislative program of trust busting and braintrusting.

The brain trusters have returned to their Olympus of omniscience in government, and their depleted ranks have been filled with reservists such as Professor Arnold.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PENSION ECONOMY?

To The Editor:

Will you please mention the fact that in 1933, under the cloak of economy, 100,000 ex-service men were stricken from the pension rolls. Please contrast this pretended economy with such extravagant expenditures as bounties to sugar plantations, cotton growers, wealthy farmers, etc. Statistics show that in taking away our pensions there was no thought of economy.

—W. W. H.

Dayton, Ohio

YOUTH WOULD FIGHT

To The Editor:

The youth of America has been betrayed by those whom we are taught to respect. Our government, which once was so ably administered by men of noble and courageous ideals, has fallen into the hands of traitors. The Constitution in all its beauty as an instrument of government is no longer practiced.

We are bitter, why shouldn't we be? We are bumming the streets, losing faith in God and in all things that are good. Where is the tranquility of peace of mind, of body and soul that we were taught about? Where is this great American plan of government which guarantees an abundance of life. It is in the hands of the Federal Reserve Bankers, the money changers who control our government—and we are denied the necessities of life.

Youth, tear down this tyrant group! Their promises are worth nothing. Tear them down, organize and plan for the revival of Americanism as you and I know it should be. We have a means of organization through social justice. I suggest that we fully acquaint ourselves with its teachings and follow a true leader, a true son of God, Father Coughlin.

—J. P.

Hollywood, Calif.

BETTER LIVING COSTLY

To The Editor:

With reference to housing conditions, here in Cambridge the slumites were driven out from such little shelter as they had, presumably so better living conditions for them could be made possible. Meanwhile, they could go to other slums.

When the buildings for their betterment were finished and ready for occupancy they were so restricted with rents and regulations that a slumite had about as much chance of getting into them as a snowball in a hot furnace. So where does the betterment come in? It seems to me their latter condition is worse than their first.

—E. W. F.

Cambridge, Mass.

COSTLY FOR CAPITAL TOO

To The Editor:

My suggestion to Father Coughlin is that he direct his efforts to the leaders of industry and show them that their error in depriving a man of a just wage is costly to them, and they will listen to him.

If he tells them it is ungodly, they will not heed. He must show them that insufficient income means eventual insufficient purchasing power for purchasers generally; that every man laid off decreases the chances of that employer's selling his own product. For, when the employer pays Tom, Tom pays Frank, and Frank then buys Tom's employer's product. If Tom is replaced by a machine, Frank can't buy what the machine produces.

Let the machine operate, but divide hours so that the employe still gets a share of the machine's profit—a living annual wage. Only then can the profit system survive.

—J. McG.

Pottsville, Pa.

WHEAT IN CHINA

To The Editor:

In Social Justice of March 7, it was proposed that the farmers raise as much wheat as possible. It is also proposed that the surplus be sent to the impoverished Chinese.

Did you ever hear the story of what happened to the Chinese when they wanted to purchase 15,000,000 bushels of wheat from Hoover's farm board and how the millers in this land were powerful enough with this farm board to get them to compel the Chinese to take a half of this 15,000,000 bushels in refined flour so that the millers could get a good sized rake-off?

—R. J. B.

Fairhaven, Mass.

DAM SQUANDERING

To The Editor:

Our former home was in the vicinity of the dam to be started at Gilbertsville Kentucky, and we know that there is a lot of unfairness and squandering there. They spent more than $1,000,000 investigating the dam site, leased all the land near it and had the people buying other homes. And as I understand it, Congress hasn't authorized the construction of the dam yet.

They valued the land at their own price and the owners had no choice but to lease it to them, and if they buy this land later on, the people will have to pay income tax on the price of their homes they have been years paying for.

Mr. Roosevelt boasts he is helping the poor man, but we poor people know that there is no end to the hardships and injustices that have been placed on us by this administration.

Of course if we want relief, we can get that, but that isn't what we want!

—K. E. O.

Flint, Mich.

PREMIUMS FOR PRODUCTION

To The Editor:

May I suggest a payment of premiums for production of those natural commodities that the Lord gave us rather than political money for destruction; also premiums in some form to the industry who toils for the cause of mankind and puts profits in employers' pockets?

Is not the latter what the excess profits tax was intended for or were we fooled on that, too?

—J. C. S.

Wilkinsburg, Pa.

SPENDING POWER WANTED

To The Editor:

I believe that farm prices should be stabilized and I do not believe that the way to prosperity is through the destruction of our production.

There is no over-production, but there is a lack of spending power. If the people had the spending power there would never be any over-production.

Never have I heard anyone remark other than that they would be glad to pay the farmer a good price for his products if they had the money and if they knew the farmer would receive the benefit instead of the middleman.

We have the picture of the swivel-chair middleman controlling the retailers' prices as well as the farmers' prices. The farmer is working for nothing and the retailer is barely getting by.

When the masses have the spending power, I believe the result would be stabilized farm prices and a direct government marketing control.

—M. K. R.

Minneapolis, Minn.

CORRUPT PARTYISM

To The Editor:

I favor the idea of abolishing partyism because I have seen so much corruptness in partyism. I once favored the Soviet System, but as I grew older, I found that even that has become nothing but self, and partyism is no better. Why not give Christianity a chance?

I have been a trade unionist all my life and their slogan has always been, one man, one job, but today, trade unionism says, one man, two or three jobs, such as the lieutenant-governor of a certain state who is secretary-treasurer of the United Mine Workers. The members of that union must pay their dollar per month, with added assessments as John Lewis wishes and we must keep silent.

I am sick of partyism with its doctrine of the survival of the fittest. The best thing I know of for the benefit of all classes is the 16 principles of social justice. Give Christ and Christianity a chance.

—J. E.

Plymouth, Pa.

TWO WAYS OUT

To The Editor:

I believe there are one or two ways for us to overcome our economic troubles, the first is to establish a dictatorship, and the second is to keep our governmental set-up intact except for perhaps minor changes and depend upon education of the masses in political economy to overcome most of our ills. The first is perhaps a shorter way, but carries too many 'ifs' in its satisfactory fulfillment for any sane person to consider it. The second seems the logical way.

I think Father Coughlin can render a very great service to us in eventually making our democracy become a reality. He can accomplish this by reverting to the role of educator in political economy and thereby in Christianity.

I believe that political economy and Christianity are as closely related to one another as is the price and value of gold and commodities.

—H. J. C.

Detroit, Mich.

SPEND FUNDS AT HOME

To The Editor:

As a union man, I believe it is time the members of the unions did something about our union leaders.

Are we going to continue permitting our labor leaders, who collect part of our dollar each month, to use this money as they wish? Who gives leaders like Matthew Woll, our vice-president, power to divert our money and efforts away from us and send it to foreign countries?

Can't we use that money for our own men who, through no fault of their own, have been laid off? Can't we finance a committee who will take our two "school kids," Mr. Green and Mr. Lewis, before the class and give them a little of the ruler? It would do more good than sending our money to China. Why should we suffer just because these two have chips on their shoulders?

They write a lot about brotherly love; it's time we ask them to practice a little of what they preach.

—J. S. N.

Two Rivers, Wis.

DEBUNK PHILOSOPHY INSTEAD

To The Editor:

It is well to "debunk Marx," but Leon Hamilton would have done better to have debunked the Marxian philosophy. Marx, the man, may have been the plagiarist and all the other things Mr. Hamilton says he was, but if his philosophy be true, to what purpose is the man debunked? "A diamond is a diamond, even though it be found in a junk pile."

For the debunking of the Marxian philosophy, let us consider the theory of "surplus value." It is undeniable that surplus value exists, but has Marx found and properly presented its source, its genesis? It exists only in civilized states. It seems to be a by-product, as it were, of the civilized state. As civilized men come together to live and work for themselves and for one another in communities, they create this surplus value.

It settles on and attaches itself to the lands they occupy. It is called "land value" but in truth the term "land value" is a misnomer. Land, apart from civilization has no value. The finest land in the world has no value until civilized communities create a value. This value seems to attach itself to and inhere in the land, but in truth it does not, for if the community pull up stakes and move elsewhere the value will go with it to its new location, and if it disband the value will evaporate. Deserted towns and cities in this and other countries demonstrate this.

Being a social product, what is its function? Civilized communities need public revenues, and larger and larger revenues as they grow larger. So does this social value that attaches to the lands they occupy. Can it be in accord with natural or divine social law that this social value should be absorbed by those who are permitted to own the land while the governments mercilessly tax industry and trade, all privately created and sustained, to the verge of extinction to raise the needed public revenues?

—Stephen Bell.

Clifton, N. J.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Damien

Concluded from Page 13

with the price of his life, he made the place illustrious and public. And that, if you consider largely, was the one reform needful; pregnant of all that should succeed. It brought money; it brought (best individual addition of them all) the sisters; it brought supervision, for public opinion and public interest landed with the man at Kalawao. If ever any man brought reforms, and died to bring them, it was he. There is not a clean cup or towel in the Bishop-Home, but dirty Damien washed it.

"Damien *was not a pure man in his relations with women, etc.*

"How do you know that? Is this the nature of the conversation in that house



on Beretania Street which the cabman envied, driving past?—Racy details of the misconduct of the poor peasant priest, toiling under the cliffs of Molokai?

"Many have visited the station before me; they seem not to have heard the rumor. When I was there I heard many shocking tales, for my informants were men speaking with the plainness of the laity; and I heard plenty of complaints of Damien. Why was this never mentioned? and how came it to you in the retirement of your clerical parlor?

"But I must not even seem to deceive you. This scandal, when I read it in your letter, was not new to me. I had heard it once before; and I must tell you how. There came to Samoa a man from Honolulu; he, in a public-house on the beach, volunteered the statement that Damien had 'contracted the disease from having connection with the female lepers'; and I find a joy in telling you how the report was welcomed in a public-house. A man sprang to his feet; I am not at liberty to give his name, but from what I heard I doubt if you would care to have him to dinner in Beretania Street. 'You miserable little——' (here is a word I dare not print, it would so shock your ears). 'You miserable little——,' he cried, 'if the story were a thousand times true, can't you see you are a million times a lower——for daring to repeat it'? I wish it could be told of you that when the report reached you in your house, perhaps after family worship, you had found in your soul enough holy anger to receive it with the same expression . . . it would have been counted to you for your brightest righteousness.

"But I fear you scarce appreciate how you appear to your fellowmen; and to bring it home to you, I will suppose



your story to be true. I will suppose—and God forgive me for supposing it—that Damien faltered and stumbled in his narrow path of duty; I will suppose that, in the horror of his isolation, perhaps in the fever of incipient disease, he, who was doing so much more than he had sworn, failed in the letter of his priestly oath—he, who was so much a better man than either you or me, who did what we have never dreamed of daring—he too tasted of our common frailty. 'O, Iago, the pity of it'! The least tender should be moved to tears; the most incredulous to prayer. And all that you could do was to pen your letter to the Reverend H. B. Gage!

"Is it growing at all clear to you what a picture you have drawn of your own heart? I will try yet once again to make it clearer. You had a father: suppose this tale were about him, and some informant brought it to you, proof in hand: I am not making too high an estimate of your emotional nature when I suppose you would regret the circumstance: that you would feel the tale of frailty the more keenly since it shamed the author of your days? and that the last thing you would do would be to publish it in the religious press? Well, the man who tried to do what Damien did, is my father, and the father of the man in the Apia bar, and the father of all who love goodness; and he was your father too, if God had given you grace to see it.

—Robert Louis Stevenson."

When Hyde read the letter his only remark was "Stevenson is simply a Bohemian crank, a negligible person, whose opinion is of no value to anyone."

Damien was dead. He could not be forgotten. Forty-six years later, in 1936, his remains were borne with honors befitting his noble soul, to his native Belgium. And there they rest, proclaiming to all the great heart that was Damien's.

"Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

TWO WEEKS LEFT — $4,650.00 WAITS

Our great "AMERICA TODAY" Contest is almost over—and once again SOCIAL JUSTICE is about to distribute a wealth of cash prizes to those of its readers who prove they know the principles of Father Coughlin.

TWO WEEKS MORE—and your opportunity to win the Grand Prize of $1,500.00 in this national competition will expire.

TWO WEEKS MORE—and your chance to be adjudged winner of the Second Prize of $750.00, the Third Prize of $250.00, the Fourth Prize of $100.00, or any of the remaining 171 cash awards will have slipped away.

IT IS NOT YET TOO LATE FOR YOU TO WIN!

But—to win—you must show sudden action, for the time is mighty short. You must send TODAY for all past questions which have appeared.

You can do this by making use of the "Past Questions" Coupon at the bottom of this announcement. Clip it now. Fill it in. Mail it. It will put you in a position to compete on an equal footing with every other person entered in the Contest.

Don't be in a position to regret. When you see the list of proper answers to the 50 simple questions a few weeks from now, you will say: "I would have set down those very answers. Why didn't I enter? I could have won the Grand Prize of $1,500.00."

And you CAN win. But—if you do not enter NOW—your name can never be listed among the winners.

Questions For This Week

QUESTION NO. 21

Who Owns The Major Portion of our National Debt?

1. Insurance companies and Federal Reserve Banks.
2. Foreign governments.
3. Private citizens.
4. Large corporations.
5. The states.
6. The House of Morgan.
7. The Bank of England.
8. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

QUESTION NO. 22

What is Fiat Money?

1. Only government "greenbacks."
2. Only Federal Reserve notes.
3. All money.
4. Only early continental currency.
5. Only money based on a silver standard.
6. Only money based on a gold standard.
7. Only money based on both gold and silver.
8. Only Confederate money.

FILL IN THIS COUPON AND MAIL WITH 10 CENTS IN COIN

Make your selection by number from suggestions under each question. Write clearly the number in the little square.

No. 21 For Question No. 21 I Select Answer No. ☐ No. 22 For Question No. 22 I Select Answer No. ☐

Name.....

Address.....

Town or City.....State.....

You Can Win If You Enter

GRAND PRIZE	**$1,500.00**
Second Prize	**$750.00**
Third Prize	**$250.00**
Fourth Prize	**$100.00**
Fifth Prize	**$50.00**
Twenty Prizes of	**$25.00 each**
150 Prizes of	**$10.00 each**

How to Proceed as a Contestant

1. Study the questions. Mark your selections of the best or most appropriate answers on the Coupons below the questions and send in EACH WEEK with 10 cents in coin (not stamps).
2. If you wish, you may pay in full, $2.50 NOW, and then send in your weekly Coupons without further remittance.
3. Each question will pertain to a live AMERICAN ISSUE discussed by Father Coughlin over the radio or in the columns of SOCIAL JUSTICE. One of the list of suggested answers underneath each question will be the best or most appropriate based upon THE VIEWPOINT OF FATHER COUGHLIN AN DTHIS WEEKLY. It is your job as a contestant to try to select that particular answer.
4. Each contestant who completes a fully qualified set of 50 answers will be entitled without further cost to have SOCIAL JUSTICE sent for six weeks to a friend or relative who is NOT NOW a subscriber. Contestants may send in the name of this friend or relation at any time during course of the Contest. The trial subscription will start at once.
5. In order to qualify for the prizes, a contestant is required to remit $2.50 for each complete set of solutions submitted and he or she is entitled to have SOCIAL JUSTICE sent to a friend or relation for each set submitted.
6. If you run more than one set of answers, be sure to mark your sets "Set 1," "Set 2," "Set 3," etc. Each set stands alone in the judging. Coupons are NOT taken from one set to fill in bad "holes" in another set.
7. If you miss any of Father Coughlin's broadcasts, send for the pamphlet containing it by addressing "Reverend Father Charles E. Coughlin, Shrine of the Little Flower, Foyal Oak, Michigan." Be sure to specify the date of the broadcast you missed.

Rules of the Contest

1. Open to all readers of SOCIAL JUSTICE except employes of Reverend Father Coughlin, members of the former National Board of National Union for Social Justice, or members of their families.
2. The Contest shall consist of 50 questions and run for 13 consecutive weeks, beginning on February 14, 1938. Two questions each week for 12 weeks and all 50 questions to appear the 13th week. Each question deals with a live economic or social problem affecting the United States.
3. A Grand Prize of $1,500.00 will be awarded the reader of SOCIAL JUSTICE returning the best or most appropriate answers to the 50 questions, such answers to be based upon the viewpoint of Father Coughlin as expressed over the radio, in the columns of SOCIAL JUSTICE or in his other public utterances. The reader or readers submitting the next nearest correct answers and otherwise complying with the rules shall be eligible for the additional prizes in the order of their correctness.
4. In order to qualify as a prize-winner the contestant is required to send in 10 cents in coin (not stamps) with each pair of answers. For these remittances the contestant shall be entitled to have SOCIAL JUSTICE sent without cost for six weeks to a friend or relation. This trial subscription is a condition for entering the contest.
5. We cannot take into account solutions without signed names or addresses. Neither can claims to their ownership be recognized. We cannot be responsible for Coupons arriving unduly late or lost in the mails. By entering the Contest the contestant agrees to accept as final the decision of the judges as to procedure and final outcome.
6. In event of ties additional questions will be submitted. In event of final ties, after two such submissions, duplicate prizes will be awarded.
7. Do NOT decorate Coupons. Neatness will NOT count.
8. Any inquiry the reply to which could not affect outcome of Contest will be acknowledged.
9. A contestant may send in any number of sets of duly qualified answers, and each set will be judged as a unit, but no individual may win more than one prize. A contestant sending in more than one fully paid set shall be entitled to have SOCIAL JUSTICE sent for six weeks to a friend or relative for each set submitted.

"Past Questions" Coupon

CONTEST EDITOR, SOCIAL JUSTICE
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN

I wish to enter the "AMERICA TODAY" Contest at once and be on an even footing with all other contestants.

Please send me free of charge, all Past Questions which have appeared up to date.

Name.....

Address.....

City.....State.....

ADDRESS:
"CONTEST EDITOR" SOCIAL JUSTICE
ROYAL OAK, MICHIGAN

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CHALLENGE TO MESSRS. SLOAN AND CHRYSLER

by Robert H. Hemphill

It is the Money in the Public's Pocket, Not the Factory Bank Balance, Which Will Determine a Manufacturer's Output Next Year.

IF YOU read the financial pages of the newspapers, you find a large part of them occupied with tabulations of current business compared with some previous period—usually with the same calendar period of the previous year, and occasionally with some notable year like 1929.

The purpose of all this data is to assist Mr. Big Businessman and Mr. Little Businessman to forecast what is immediately ahead for his own enterprises.

It has required four or five thousand years to teach business men that if one business of general nature is bad, their own respective businesses are likely to suffer in about the same proportion. It seems to me that this simple fact is very little to have learned in several thousand years. It is curious that our smart business leaders seem to have no inclination to learn why business is good or bad.



It is almost obvious that if all business is bad or all good in about the same proportion, there must be some underlying and fluctuating cause which, properly identified, should be studied and could, possibly, be controlled.

TO GET down to brass tacks without further preamble, I will make a statement that should startle Mr. Sloan, Mr. Chrysler and all the other smart heads of our outstanding corporations.

It is possible, and comparatively easy to calculate now, just how much money can and will be spent for automobiles within the next twelve months.

There is nothing mysterious or very complicated about such a calculation. It is rather simple mathematics.

It is as easy to calculate how much money will be spent for shoes, clothing, food, amusements, or any other article or service which the general public buys.

There is no reason to guess at these things, excepting a most amazing ignorance.

If Mr. Sloan had put one one-thousandth the effort on a certain line of economic research that he has spent in engineering research, he would be able to plan his operations with the knowledge that he could sell a definite number of automobiles in 1938.

Mr. Sloan or Mr. Chrysler, or any other man of intelligence, could learn the essential facts which would make such a calculation possible in one afternoon of intensive study.

I am fully aware that this statement is a challenge and it is so intended.

You will notice that I do not mention Mr. Henry Ford. The reason is that Mr. Ford already knows why business is good or bad; and I strongly suspect he can, and already has, calculated just about what his share of it is going to be. If he has not gone that far, I could teach him how in about five minutes, with the knowledge he already has.

Diogenes said:

"There is only one good, namely Knowledge; and only one evil, namely Ignorance."

I CANNOT consider a man very smart, who confines his study of economics to the contemplation of his own bank account. The money he has in the bank is not going to be used to buy his output. It is the money other people have, or are likely to have, which should be the subject for his inquiry; for *the money all the rest of the nation is to have in 1938 will determine the number of automobiles which will be purchased,* the amount which will be spent for food, clothing, shelter, transportation, communication, health, comfort, recreation and amusement.

No effort on the part of the producers of the nation will effect material variation in these amounts. To ignore the available information is about as sensible as to attempt to build a new and radical design of automobile without first having made working drawings, and certainly no capable manager would dream of doing that.

A man who had no knowledge of mechanical engineering might make such an attempt.

Mr. Sloan or Mr. Chrysler would consider such a man incredibly ignorant.

TO THE practical economist, the spectacle of great corporations making elaborate and expensive expansion or production plans without having first determined the maximum sales possibilities for the product appears to be equally absurd, and those responsible equally and inexcusably ignorant.

But that is what these smart men do, over and over again.

Sir Oliver Lodge said:

"The ordinary run of men live among phenomena of which they know nothing and care less. They see bodies fall to the earth, they hear sounds, they kindle fires, they see the heavens roll above them, but of the causes and inner workings of the whole thing they are ignorant and with their ignorance they are content."

Because the business leaders of the country refuse to acquaint themselves with a few simple, fundamental economic laws, their own businesses suffer and unemployment and hunger and poverty and misery stalk through a land endowed with natural and developed resources ample to give everyone a standard of living beyond the dreams of Utopians, and in consequence demagogs and political parasites impose upon the people, with hare-brained schemes to repeal immutable natural laws, in a vain quest for relief from a baffling inability to enjoy the abundance which is everywhere visible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Security

Concluded from Page 5

cent of his weekly wage during the autumn of 1934 was taken out for social security taxes. It is well to remember that a similar amount was exacted from the employer while the German government was forced to subsidize the fund close to a quarter billion dollars in 1934. The facts and figures tell their own story.

IN 1911, when social security was introduced in England, three per cent of her workers were unemployed. In 1936, 17 per cent of the workers were out of jobs. In France, where the law is condemned by all classes, the municipal budget of the Assistance Publique for 1932 had risen to 647,899,129 francs. This sum was 45,000,000 francs larger than the budget for 1931.

So far as social security in Europe is concerned, it has spelled nothing more or less than increased public debt, unemployment, dependency and decreased self-reliance. Being purely negative in its purpose, it has failed miserably in solving the grave economic and social problems facing the families of the European nations. It has not raised the average family above the poverty line. It has succeeded, in dropping countless families below the poverty line by the imposition of taxes that pauperize these families.

Social security in Europe has all the earmarks of political expediency with its concurrent evils. Born of political necessity, it has developed into a worthless and unfortunate child.

The saddest part of the European story is what happened to the social security funds collected in Germany from 1883 to 1914. Outside of the actual funds paid to dependents during these years, the remainder was dumped in the trenches in the hope of winning the World War. The money purposely collected to succor dependency was used to carry on the war. Is it not possible that the money was spent to prolong the greatest catastrophe in modern times?

SOCIAL SECURITY does not eliminate the fundamental causes of poverty. It does not rectify the social and economic evils that produce poverty. It adds nothing to the volume of national wealth. In most instances, social security does not secure the family in its dependent condition. Before the Federal Social Security Act was passed in 1935, monthly payments made by various states to these families ranged from $69.31 in Massachusetts to $4.33 in Arkansas. How a father with five children in the first named state was able to rear his family in decent comfort on $69 a month must have been known to the authorities in Massachusetts. How a father with the same size family was capable of placing a loaf of bread on his table for each meal in the state of Arkansas, with the munificent sum of $4.33, is beyond even the comprehension of the authorities who administered the fund.

No one cares to end his days in the poorhouse. There is an odium attached to the home over the hill. No one wishes to live on the dole. The proponents of a Social Security program see nothing for the dependent individual or family visited by one of the hazards causing dependency except the poorhouse or the dole. Evidently, these friends of the Social Security plan do not know, or they hide the fact, that in England, for instance, Social Security for the unemployed, the sick and disabled is the dole. The thousands living in the Limehouse section of London, the coal mines of Wales and the slums of Glasgow are living on Social Security which is the dole. The English government is satisfied to hand out this dole, which in numerous cases does not exceed 18 shillings a week, or $4.50. Nothing has been done to remove the cause of poverty or dependency or to ameliorate the condition of millions living in want. Social Security in England, as in the rest of Europe, remains a negative means, a hit or miss affair, to satisfy the hunger of poverty for fear that the poor may otherwise revolt.

What will happen when the tax burden upon the worker's pay envelope becomes too great and governments on the verge of bankruptcy are unable to meet the demands of the dependent family, need not be left to conjecture. The inevitable consequence will be revolution with all its stark reality. Then the half-crazed masses will no longer be willing to accept what governments offer, they will take by force what is rightfully their own. It happened in France after profligate kings literally drove the people into revolution, in the closing years of the eighteenth century. It may happen in any of the 43 countries that have adopted the Social Security plan with the hope that it will appease the demands of the poor for the right to live.

I stated in the beginning that the Associated Press dispatch of January 3, 1938, was of far-reaching importance to the workman and his family. Analyzing this dispatch, the Federal Government intends to meet the 1939 deficit created by Federal spending with the monies in the Social Security fund. According to the Senate Committee on Finance, *74th Congress, first session, Calendar No. 661, Report No. 628, Page 9,* the probable size of the old-age reserve account in 1980 will amount to $46,942,700,000.

The eternal "IF" now enters into consideration.

IF the Government intends borrowing the money from the Social Security fund to meet deficits each year, how much of the fund will be in existence in 1980?

IF the Government intends to divert the fund to other purposes, what will the aged receive from now until 1980, and thereafter? IF these billions are to be expended for every will-o-the-wisp of politicians more concerned with their political future than the public good, what is to prevent the same disposition being made of the fund as happened in Germany in 1914?

If the Secretary of the Treasury may borrow the Social Security monies to conceal the huge deficits created year after year, will not the plight of the American workman be on the same plane with the English worker who lives off the dole?

Spain

Concluded from Page 11

interference and the alien peoples which really created the sacrifice of half of Spain.

THERE is no country in the world where social justice, in actual fact, exists. There might be gradations of the social injustice dominating in the different countries, but if social injustice had been the main, or only, reason for the civil war in Spain, it would seem reasonable that we should have repetitions of this sad affair in other countries. I might say—and on this point I agree with Mr. Edwards and with SOCIAL JUSTICE—that *in the United States there is much more social injustice than ever existed in Spain before the revolution.* I shall agree, also, that social justice is a very important preventive of revolution.

Precisely that part of Spain and Andalusia where the wages were lowest, and old Castille and Navarra, where the land is least divided, have been the very ones where the traditions have been kept alive. In the wealthy towns, where there was more prosperity in industry, where the land was more divided and where there were no "bad land owners" or "bad aristocrats," the ravages of Communism is most severe. Those who had previously received lowest wages, those who were poor—but particularly those who would not subscribe to the poison of bolshevism and the French popular front—have been the greatest supporters of General Franco.

The tremendous battle for better living conditions had been fought—and won—in Catalonia, not by the people and the big land owners, but by the small owners of land and its cultivators called "Rabasaires"—people who own from 300 to 500 acres, and who decided, years ago, to give their lands over for cultivation to small families. These owners of the land were taking only a small percentage of the crop; the great percentage of the yield was going to the laborer who was working the land. The owner contributed advice and saw to an advantageous selling of the product, especially the manufacture of the good wines of the Tarragona valley.

This amicable association had been going on for centuries and the legislation of it was considered most fair; land owners, cultivators and laborers in this part of Spain were living a contented, wonderful life, with no abuses whatever, up to the time the Russian agitators poisoned their minds!

Fifteen days before the revolution started. I was talking to one of these little land owners who was begging me to find him a job in the Philippines; because he could no longer collect rent from his people, and because he was certain that he would be killed if he tried to collect anything from the farmers.

AFTER the World War, Spain became wealthy because of her non-intervention in European affairs. We had an overabundance for a while and we did not know how to take such an accumulation of wealth as we had during the war. So, after the Russian revolution, Spain was found a good field in which to propagate the Russian ideas. Please take into consideration that the National army revolted in July, 1936, to save the country from a government whose aim was to establish a soviet regime in Spain!

But the whole thing actually had its origin back in 1923. We were unpardoned for the crime of not going to war with the Allies and we were the envy of France and Russia for our wealth, prosperity, property, happiness, and we especially merited hate because we were Catholics! Mussolini stopped Communism in Italy, Primo de Rivera followed him to establish a dictatorship in Spain. He was a good man. He had a good heart and good faith to solve the detrimental problems of Spain. He did many good deeds; as a matter of fact, during his regime Spain was a paradise. But he was too good hearted; he was not strong enough, and was more of a dictator than a leader. So, finally, in a weak moment he could not dominate the politicians and he quit.

Do you know that since 1908 we have had an endemic of anarchism in Barcelona? Bombs exploded from time to time and Primo de Rivera came into power because many industrialists were killed in Barcelona during a reign of terror between 1920 and 1923. He managed to stop Communism in Spain but once he failed, the greed for power of the agitators, and the help from the government, prepared the revolution which exploded in October, 1934.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED



Great Interest

is being manifested by people of this country in the Shrine of the Little Flower at Royal Oak, Michigan. A new and tremendous awakening to the important part the Shrine is taking in the religious, political and economic affairs of the nation is revealed every day. At this hour, its prominence is *greater than ever before.*

When would be the best time to visit the Shrine?

Can arrangements be made whereby we can stay at Royal Oak?

Will Father Coughlin preach at any of the Masses?

Questions like these, and many others, are found in the letters received every day. For your own information and that of your friends, organized tours and pilgrimages are again to be made to the Shrine during the summer. Railroads, buses, airplanes and other transportation agencies are making arrangements whereby everyone will have an opportunity to visit the Shrine.

PILGRIMS TO THE SHRINE

by Rev. Cyril Keating

The Shrine of the Little Flower in Royal Oak, Michigan, has become a place of pilgrimage for thousands of devout men and women. They come from every state in the nation. They belong to all creeds. They represent all races.

Here they come to find spiritual consolation and to be refreshed in mind and body. They come to pray and to seek the blessings of God. They implore the gifts of God for their friends and relatives. It is here that the religious ceremonies are viewed in all the richness and color of the ancient liturgy. In these religious rites, the people manifest their faith in the living God. They show their intense love of Him.

Within its monastic walls, men and women of all ages kneel in prayer. They implore the mercy of God. The beauty of this magnificent edifice overawes the visitor as he sets his foot inside its sacred precincts. The splendor of its marble altars and the richness of its statuary hold the admiration of everyone. It is imposing in its mighty structure. Its simplicity appeals to the heart of the visitor. The tone of its grand organ, the splendor of its magnificent marble altars and the beauty of the Little Flower Chapel will appeal to every man, woman and child. Niagara may have its wonders, the cathedrals of Europe and the palaces of the Orient may have attractions beyond the comprehension of the human mind, but as remarked time after time by the visitor, "We have never seen anything like it; it is wonderful."

Last summer more than 100,000 people visited the Shrine. Tremendous groups were organized all over the country. They came by train, car and bus. Everyone enjoyed his visit. Each person was moved by the grandeur of the ceremonies, the beauty of its natural setting and the fervent faith of the many pilgrims. If an unbeliever does not always fall to his knees in prayer, he remains to wonder and marvel at the spectacle before him.

From every city and village upon the Eastern seaboard, across the broad expanse of land to the cities of the wide Pacific, from many homes of the sunny South and dwellings of Northern cities will come devout men and women of every nationality and creed.

Once again, certain Sundays of the summer months are to be dedicated to the different states and cities of the nation. On that day all the services and religious ceremonies, including Father Coughlin's discourse, will be in honor of the people from the city to whom the day has been dedicated.

On each Sunday, a solemn High Mass will be celebrated by Father Coughlin. The senior choir at this Mass will be composed of thirty professional singers. The junior choir consists of sixty youths. They are dressed in black and purple cassocks, white surplices and purple silk neckties. Father Coughlin delivers the discourse at this Mass. In the afternoon special services are held for the people to whom the day has been dedicated.

The solemn High Mass with a vested double choir will take place at 10 o'clock in the morning. All the visitors will receive a cordial welcome by Father Coughlin. In the afternoon, Father Coughlin will explain the symbolism of the church. Afterwards, another priest will direct the visitors to the beautiful flower grotto. It was upon this spot that the old Shrine, made famous by the nation-wide broadcasts of Father Coughlin, stood. It was destroyed by fire over a year ago. Now it has developed into a beautiful rose garden dedicated to Ste. Therese who promised to spend her life in heaven "showering down roses." It is planned to make this spot the most beautiful garden in the country.

Where formerly rested the walls of the quaint old Shrine, Stations of the Cross have been erected. The aisles, where formerly we were accustomed to tread with silent step, are now beds of roses so beloved by the Little Flower in her lifetime. Upon the spot where the altar used to be is now a large mound of clustered flowers. A beautiful statue of the Little Flower has been placed there. In front of this mound is a sparkling pool of water, reflecting the surrounding beauty. Visitors will never forget their visit to the grotto.

From reports received so far, there will be a close race between the cities of Ohio and those bordering upon the Atlantic seacoast for the honor of bringing the largest group to the Shrine. Railroads are making preparations to handle large groups. Thousands of others are driving their own cars, timing their trip to arrive early in the morning of the dedicated day.

Interested parties are requested to write to Father Coughlin for more information. A complete schedule of the dedication days will appear shortly in the pages of Social Justice.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TIMELINESS!

Today's news this week!

Now that my broadcast time has been expended, you will expect timely information on matters affecting you and your liberties.

Social Justice magazine copy will leave my desk Monday at noon. The same week the magazine will be in your hands.

You and your friends may not learn of a second or third reorganization bill until Congress will have passed it unless you subscribe now for this timely publication.

Won't you help?

Cordially yours,
Father Coughlin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED